FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 125 *29 June 1982*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

U.S., Soviet Positions Contrast in Arms Talks AA 1
Vladen Kuznetsov Commentary AA 1
Vasiliy Kharkov Commentary AA 2
Conditions for Success AA 3
INF Talks Plenary Session Held 29 June AA 4
Shuttle, Space Command Mark U.S. 'Warfare' Plans AA 4
[Linnik in PRAVDA 29 Jun]
Gromyko Has 'Warm, Comradely' Talks With Gus Hall AA 4
[PRAVDA 18 Jun]
NOVOYE VREMYA Comments on Brezhnev Message to UN AA 5
[Kravtsov, No 25]
Bolkhin Reports to UN on Nuclear War Effects AA 8
PRAVDA Details Peace Demonstrations in USSR AA 8
[Timofeyeva, 18 Jun]

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

International Situation -- Questions and Answers CC 1
[Kosovan, Semenov, Glukhov]
Nuclear Arms Stance CC 1
'Crisis in NATO' CC 1
Kampuchean Situation CC 3
Near East 'Tragedy' CC 3
Lebanon, Falkland Islands Hostilities Compared CC 5
[Pustov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 20 Jun]

FALKLAND ISLANDS CRISIS

IZVESTIYA on UK Reaction to End of Falklands War DD 1
[Skosyrev, 22 Jun]

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Background of Haig Resignation Scrutinized A 1
Kolesnichenko Dispatch [PRAVDA 27 Jun] A 1
TASS Commentator [Kornilov] A 2
Losev Analysis A 3
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA on U.S. Electronic Espionage A 4
[Vartanesyan, 18 Jun]

CHINA

PRC Scientists at Symposium in Dushanbe B 1
Moscow Television on Beijing Track Event B 1

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Tikhonov Congratulates Malaysian Prime Minister E 1
Kampuchean Army Praised on 31st Anniversary E 1
[Nikulchenkov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Jun]

EASTERN EUROPE

Materials on 12th LCY Congress in Yugoslavia F 1
USSR Delegation Leaves Moscow F 1
Congress Opens F 1
CPSU CC Greetings F 1
Dragosavac Address F 2
PRAVDA Account [22 Jun] F 3
Kuznetsov Meets Stambolic F 3
Kuznetsov, Culafic Meet F 3
Kuznetsov Shipyard Speech F 4
Church's Role in 13 Jun Polish Riots Attacked F 7
[Tsoppi in LITERNATURNAYA GAZETA 23 Jun]
GDR Weekly Cited on Anti-Polish Subversion F 8
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Jun]
Report on GDR-USSR Commission Session in Moscow F 9
[East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND 19/20 Jun]
RCP Delegation Received by Kapitonov F 12
[PRAVDA 18 Jun]
Hungary's Losonczi Sends Message to Brezhnev F 13
[PRAVDA 18 Jun]
PRAVDA Notes Marchuk Meetings With Kadar, Lazar F 13
[18 Jun]
Demichev's Arrival in Budapest Reported F 13

WESTERN EUROPE

Continuing Coverage of Joint Space Mission G 1
Experiments Begin G 1
Cosmonauts' Press Conference G 1
Further European Reaction to U.S. Gas Pipes Ban G 2
EEC 'Indignation' [Kiselev] G 2
FRG Criticism G 3
Commentary on Spanish Position on Gibraltar G 4
Greece's 'Special Relationship' With NATO G 4
Brezhnev Congratulates Portuguese on National Day G 5
CPSU Delegation Attends UNSERE ZEIT Festival G 5
[PRAVDA 19 Jun]

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

King Husayn Exchanges Views With Soviet Leaders H 1
Husayn Departs H 1
PLO Official Says Israelis Use Nerve Gas H 1
Arab Foreign Ministers End Tunis Conference H 2

Saudi King Fahd Sends Message to Brezhnev H 2
Tashkent on U. S. Intentions in Lebanon H 2
Uzbek People Protest Israeli Actions in Lebanon H 3
PRC Policy on Iran, Persian Gulf Assailed H 4
National Liberation Movements Seminar Assessed H 5
[Sheftunov]

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

S. Africa Dreams of SATO Role After Falklands J 1
[Golubev in SELSKAYA ZHIZN 22 Jun]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Kiselev Addresses Brazil Congress on Disarmament K 1
RPP: Brazil Distancing Itself From U.S. Policy K 3

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Leaders Discuss May Plenum, Food Program R 1
Gorbachev in Yaroslavl R 1
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Jun]
Solomentsev in Ryazan R 6
[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Jun]
Kuznetsov in Bashkiriya R 9
[IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]
Romanov Presents Order to Engineering Institute R 12
Shevardnadze Presents Red Banner Award R 12
TV Reports on Economic Education Decision R 12
Falin Views America's 'Turn from Detente' R 13
[ZNAMYA No 4]

U.S., SOVIET POSITIONS CONTRAST IN ARMS TALKS

Vladen Kuznetsov Commentary

LD281102 Moscow World Service in English 0700 GMT 28 Jun 82

[Text] Soviet-American talks on the limitation and reduction of strategic arms are to resume on 29 June in Geneva. The commentary now is from our observer, Vladen Kuznetsov:

This question is crucial to international security. Its outcome will have much bearing on what the world political climate will be like in the future. The Soviet Union has been doing all it can to prevent a sliding down to nuclear war.

At the 26th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party in the spring of 1981 the problem of limiting and reducing arms was described as of paramount importance. The Soviet Union then offered to the United States to resume without delay negotiations on the issue, (?with) keeping intact all positive that had been gained in the field. However, it took the Reagan administration 18 months to agree to talks on strategic arms. It took it about a year, incidentally, to enter into negotiations with the Soviet Union on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe.

The Soviet Union proposed a choice of options from sizeable reductions by hundreds of units of both medium-range and tactical weapons to scrapping these weapons altogether in Europe. More than that, the Soviet Union stopped unilaterally further deploying medium-range missiles in its European part, and has already got down to their substantial reduction. At the same time the Soviet Union declared that it did not intend to site additionally missiles where West European countries would be within their range. As for strategic arms the Soviet Union is ready to begin negotiations on them, by agreeing to freeze this most destructive means of annihilation in terms of quantity and modernization.

The USSR also made its position clear on the factors that could contribute to agreement. The first is that negotiations should pursue the goal of restricting and limiting strategic arms and not be a cover for continuing the arms race and breaking the parity in strategic arms between the two countries. The second is that it is necessary for both sides to conduct negotiations on a single productive basis of taking into account the interests of each other's security and in strict compliance with the principle of equality and equal security. The third is that if agreement is to be really achieved, everything positive and useful gained so far must be preserved. This includes the SALT-II treaty, which the United States had shelved, undermining international trust and security tangibly.

Regrettably the American administration's current approach offers no promise either. It puts one on guard. Although the American side agreed to resume talks, it has never endorsed the SALT II accord, nor has it ratified two other major Soviet-American documents, the 1974 treaty on the limitation of underground tests of nuclear weapons and the 1976 agreement on underground nuclear explosions in [as heard] peaceful purposes. Such stalling sharply contrasts really titanic efforts to speed up the realization of many Pentagon programs, above all the strategic arms.

If the Soviet Union has done nothing since the time of the signing of the SALT II treaty in 1979 to change the approximate strategic parity stipulated by this document, the United States has clearly taken the course toward achieving military superiority. It has already got down to deploying advanced strategic missiles MX, sea-based ballistic missiles Trident-I and Trident-2, new strategic bombers and long-range cruise missiles.

While the Soviet Union has been suggesting to freeze strategic arms, the United States has been spurring the escalation of the arms race and this arms drive involves not only advanced arms, but conventional ones, too. True, for some time now the United States President has been making calls for reducing strategic arms, but the American plan clearly has a trick in it. According to it, the USSR is to reduce the components of the strategic potential in which advantage is on its side, -- for instance, ground-based missiles.

As for the missiles on submarines, strategic bombers and cruise missiles -- that is, the components of the strategic potential where the United States has advantage -- Washington intends to keep them actually intact.

The Soviet Union does not seek military superiority. Nor is it going to recognize anyone's right to it. Equal potentials (?are up for) equal reductions: That's the only way to agreement.

The Soviet foreign minister, Andrey Gromyko, at a news conference in New York wished that the Soviet Union and the United States would reach agreement on strategic arms. With such a wish the Soviet delegation will arrive for negotiations in Geneva and to show good example and consolidate mutual trust, the Soviet Union unilaterally committed itself not to use nuclear weapons first. The ball now is in Washington's court.

Vasiliy Kharkov Commentary

LD281504 Moscow TASS in English 1440 GMT 28 Jun 82

[Firm Foundation: Equality and Undiminished Security" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS -- TASS news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov writes:

Profound interest which political and public circles are showing in Soviet-American negotiations on limitation and reduction of strategic armaments, due to open in Geneva on Tuesday, is attributed to their international significance. Further development of the international situation will largely depend on whether an accord is reached or not between the USSR and the United States on this key problem of the present. It is natural therefore that the world public pins major hopes on the negotiations.

As is known, the Soviet Union's stand is that this accord should be honest and fair. It should not infringe upon anybody's interests. The Soviet Union holds that solution of the given key problem on a mutually acceptable foundation would be a very important contribution to consolidation of international security, improvement of the situation in the world. Therefore, the USSR favours such an accord with the United States which would provide for a substantial quantitative reduction of strategic armaments and would simultaneously set restrictions on their qualitative perfection.

The Soviet Union strives to see to it that from the very beginning the negotiations be purposeful and constructive. The Soviet Union's attitude to negotiations is serious and responsible. The evidence of that is the stand of the Soviet Union at the Geneva negotiations, which was clearly set forth by the Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev at the congress of the Young Communist League in Moscow in May and in the memorandum, which was submitted to the U.N. General Assembly's second special session on disarmament. In the Soviet Union's opinion, the success of the negotiations would undoubtedly be promoted by three factors. First, these negotiations should really pursue the aim of limitation and reduction of strategic armaments and should not serve as a cover up for continuation of the arms race and disrupting of the existing parity. Second, the sides should conduct negotiations with due account for the legitimate interests of each other's security, in strict accordance with the principles of equality and undiminished security. And, finally, it is necessary to preserve everything possible which was attained in that sphere before.

The main provisions of the U.S. stand were also announced in Washington. When one analyses these provisions, he involuntarily develops the impression that they are prompted by the desire to change the existing correlation of forces in the military sphere in favour of the United States, to attain unilateral advantage. Top representatives of the Department of State made in Washington in the past few days statements that the United States does not intend to give up its plans of "modernizing the strategic nuclear systems". If these statements have the aim to create a relevant tone for the beginning of the negotiations, this bids nothing good.

It is to be recalled that the Soviet Union is ready to agree that weapons of strategic purpose of the USSR and the United States should be frozen quantitatively, as soon as negotiations begin, and that modernization of these weapons should be restricted to the minimum. This would undoubtedly promote success of the negotiations and facilitate the advance towards radical limitation and reduction of strategic armaments.

The Soviet Union sincerely wishes attainment of an accord with the United States. It is exactly with such a desire that the Soviet delegation came to Geneva. If the American delegation is also guided by the principle of equality and undiminished security, the negotiations will justify the peoples' hopes on them.

Conditions for Success

LD290218 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 28 Jun 82

[Col (Eduard Grigoryev) commentary]

[Text] On Tuesday Soviet-American talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms will get underway in Geneva.

The Soviet delegation is ready for constructive and purposeful work. It will be pressing for a decision that would help reinforce international stability and serve the interests of peace. The head of the Soviet delegation, Viktor Karpov, said as much upon his arrival in Geneva. The official statements made in Moscow lead one to conclude that the USSR would like to oreserve the positive [as heard] that has been achieved when the SALT I and SALT II agreements were prepared. No wonder; at the time much was done by both the Soviet side and three American administrations, those of Nixon, Ford and Carter, to reach mutually acceptable agreements.

The coming talks must be viewed as a followup of the process of nuclear disarmament, a process of vital import for the fate of humanity. It would be wise, of course, to expand and supplement the provisions of the SALT II treaty, not only provisions related to limiting and reducing strategic nuclear arms but also those concerning limitations of the qualitative parameters of these arms.

The Soviet Union is for an understanding with the United States that will provide for substantial quantitative reductions in strategic arms and at the same time set effective limitations on their qualitative modernization. An understanding of this kind must be based in full measure on the principle of equality and equal security and must meet the lawful interests of both sides. One must say in advance that the United States administration's attempts to insist on selective reductions of arms to suit the United States alone cannot make the negotiations a success. For example, President Reagan's proposals ignore the fact that the United States has an almost threefold edge on the Soviet Union in warheads of ballistic missiles based on submarines, and a much greater edge in aircraft carrying nuclear weapons. President Reagan's proposals sidestep a whole range of advanced strategic weapons being energetically developed in the United States. Anyone can see that such a one-sided approach cannot square with searches for mutually acceptable understandings.

If a nuclear war is to be forestalled, it is essential to set obstacles on the way of developing and producing new kinds of strategic arms. If another round of the arms race is to be prevented it is essential to put paid to the development of costly and deadly weapons like the American MX, Trident, Pershing and cruise missiles and the B-1 and Stealth bombers. Another pressing need is to notably reduce armaments. If balanced and equal agreements are reached to this effect, they will help save humanity from a nuclear catastrophe.

The Soviet Union made a really historic move when it pledged never to be the first to use nuclear arms. The Soviet initiative announced by President Brezhnev in a message to the United Nations General Assembly is stimulating the Soviet-American talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms that will open in Geneva on Tuesday.

To make the negotiations a success there must be reciprocity and the right tone from the very beginning. There also must be good will and strict observance of the principle of equality and equal security. It is in this spirit that the Soviet Union is going to talk on the problem, a problem on which the fate of world peace depends to so great a degree.

INF TALKS PLENARY SESSION HELD 29 JUNE

LD291006 Moscow TASS in English 1000 GMT 29 Jun 82

[Text] Geneva June 29 TASS -- A plenary meeting of the delegations of the USSR and the USA at the talks on the limitation of nuclear arms in Europe was held here today.

SHUTTLE, SPACE COMMAND MARK U.S. 'WARFARE' PLANS

LD290507 Moscow TASS in English 0459 GMT 29 Jun 82

["Washington's Militaristic Orbit" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 29 TASS -- Outer space should serve peace -- in a way as is patently illustrated by the joint Soviet-French flight, Viktor Linnik writes in the newspaper PRAVDA today.

The fourth test flight of the spaceship Columbia in the United States assumes an ominous meaning against this background, the commentator stresses. That flight, according to the press, signifies an end to "innocent flights" of American astronouts. Military cargo was placed for the first time aboard the spaceship which is now in a near-earth orbit. According to American estimates, up to 1994 half of all cargoes of the "shuttle" spaceships will be of military purpose.

The American press regards the Pentagon's recent decision on forming a special Space Command as of September 1 this year within the framework of the U.S. Air Force, as another step in that direction. The special Space Command is bound in the future to fully control the space activities of various types of American Armed Forces, the commentary runs. The scripts of "space warfare" are now written not in Hollywood but in the Pentagon, in the laboratories and test grounds of which laser and anti-sputnik weapons are now being developed.

Washington, flouting the world public opinion, the firmly expressed peoples' will for peace, seeks to impose upon mankind a new dangerous round of the arms race.

GROMYKO HAS 'WARM, COMRADELY' TALK WITH GUS HALL

PM251435 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 82 p 4

[Text] New York, 17 Jun (TASS) -- A meeting has taken place here between A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States.

During the talk G. Hall assessed highly L.I. Brezhnev's message to the UN General Assembly second special session and the Soviet peace initiatives put forward at the session, which give new impetus to the further activation of the mass movement for peace, the prevention of nuclear war and the prohibition of the most dangerous types of weapons and against the growth of aggressive militarist tendencies in the U.S. ruling circles' policy.

The meeting took place in a warm, comradely atmosphere.

NOVOYE VREMYA COMMENTS ON BREZHNEV MESSAGE TO UN

PM251049 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA in Russian No 25, 18 Jun 82 pp 5-7

[V. Kravtsov article: "A Step of Exceptional Importance"]

[Text] L.I. Brezhnev's message to the second UN General Assembly special session on disarmament solemnly declares: The USSR pledges not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. This is a step of exceptional importance, particularly in view of the current situation in the world.

Present-day international reality is diverse and contradictory. The problems facing many states, including problems in interstate relations, are tremendous. For some people, as practice shows, the temptation to resort to force of arms in conflict situations is proving overwhelming. This is confirmed by the events in the Near East and the South Atlantic and the war between Iran and Iraq. The United States and the NATO bloc, which it heads, gambling on the attainment of military superiority over the socialist states, have sharply increased the arms race, are whipping up tension first in one region of the globe, then in another, and are interfering in the internal affairs of sovereign states. Justified concern for the fate of world peace is invading people's thoughts.

A problem common to all mankind stands out sharply against the background of the prevailing world situation. In the face of this problem, contradictions between states, differences in their social structure or ideology and short-term, transient interests fade into the background. It is the problem of preserving human civilization itself. This question has never before arisen in history. It has been brought to the fore by the rapid development of science and technology, obscenely transformed into the creation of increasingly lethal types of weapons. It is no exaggeration to say that in the last decades of the 20th century people have acquired, so to speak, the technical capacity to destroy all living things on earth.

A man's consciousness can hardly accommodate this fact, for instance. One -- just one -- B-1 strategic bomber (the first 100 are now entering production in the United States) could carry nuclear weapons with a destructive power exceeding the capacity of all the bombs dropped during World War II, a war which took more than 50 million human lives. It has been calculated that a mass of explosives has already been accumulated for every living soul, and the growth in armaments is still continuing. "Where next," as the saying goes. A stern warning can be heard in the declaration on the prevention of nuclear catastrophe, adopted by the United Nations last year: "All the horrors of past wars and all the other disasters which have fallen to the lot of man would fade into insignificance beside the results of the use of nuclear weapons, which are capable of destroying civilization on earth."

Many people admit verbally that for all the urgency of the problems facing states, there is no task more burning, more truly global, than the task of preventing nuclear devastation. But of course, it is not enough just to note this fact -- a fact which is urgent and decisive in present-day conditions. What is needed is real deeds, practical actions by states with the aim of stopping the world from slipping toward the nuclear abyss, breaking the present dangerous trends and channeling the course of events toward more lasting, reliable peace. The Soviet Union's step is a model of such purposeful, bold actions.

Yes, bold. After all, it is being carried out in a situation where the nuclear powers belong to the North Atlantic pact -- and what that aggressive bloc is directed against is well known -- do not exclude the possibility of the first use of nuclear weapons. Moreover U.S. and NATO military doctrine is, in effect, based on the precondition that they could inflict the first nuclear strike in the event, for instance, of a hypothetical invasion of Western Europe by Soviet tanks.

They go even further -- they talk about a preemptive nuclear attack if, as they put it, there are grounds for believing that the enemy is ready to attack. Extremely dangerous concepts! Yet material foundations are being created for them in the form of a new generation of nuclear arms which, by virtue of their characteristics, could be used precisely for a first nuclear strike.

The Soviet Union is taking the action announced in L.I. Brezhnev's message because it believes in the force of common sense and in mankind's ability to avoid nuclear conflict.

The logic is very clear -- being the first to use nuclear weapons means unleashing nuclear war. And that, as has by now been proved irrefutably, could lead not only to the destruction of all that man has created, but to the undermining of the very foundations of life on our planet. How is it possible even to imagine in theory that nuclear weapons will be used? Are there any arguments to justify the doctrine of the first nuclear strike, if that will unleash a chain of actions and reactions as a result of which any goals originally planned will prove meaningless? After all, whatever the force of the first strike, the nuclear aggressor will inevitably be overtaken by retribution and the authors of the insane doctrines will share the fate which they would like to prepare for millions of people.

If this is so -- and it cannot be disputed -- then it is the highest duty of state leaders who are aware of their responsibility for the peoples' future to make every effort to ensure that nuclear weapons are never used. The Soviet Union proceeds on the basis of this conviction.

The force of a good example plays a considerable role, of course. The peoples have a right to expect that our act of good will -- and it has been undertaken by the Soviet Union unilaterally -- will be followed by corresponding steps by other nuclear states. If they made an equally clear and precise pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, that would, in effect, be tantamount to the renunciation of the use of nuclear weapons in general. Obviously, if there is no first nuclear strike, there will be no need for a second, or third, or any subsequent strike.

To reduce to nil the probability of the use of nuclear weapons -- that is the will of the vast majority of states in the world. Their opinion on this score was expressed quite clearly at the 36th UN General Assembly Session, which proclaimed: "States and statesmen which are the first to resort to the use of nuclear weapons will be committing the gravest crime against mankind." We must not underestimate the moral and political significance of the declaration adopted by the United Nations, which we have already cited, or of the climate of implacability ("there will never be either justification or forgiveness for any statesmen adopting the decision to be the first to use nuclear weapons") which it creates around actions pushing the world toward catastrophe. The Soviet Union's present initiative continues and substantially enriches progress in the direction demanded by the peoples' clearly expressed aspirations.

The problems of limiting the arms race, first and foremost the nuclear arms race, are not simple. And those who are whipping up the buildup of nuclear arsenals, who put more and more new military programs into production, often hide behind these complexities in order to conceal their reluctance to embark on the path leading to disarmament.

As a result of the Soviet Union's action a whole range of issues associated with nuclear disarmament appear in a new light. The preconditions for banning nuclear weapons are improving. The Soviet Union has been advocating this since the moment when the power of the atom began to be used for military purposes. But of course, it is necessary for other powers to stop keeping the nuclear trigger cocked and to join the Soviet Union in its initiative.

The Soviet Union considers it useful to elaborate and adopt a nuclear disarmament program, which would be implemented by stages.

One of the first stages could be the ending of the production of fissile materials for the creation of various types of nuclear weapons. Many other states have come out in the same spirit. Moving to meet their wishes, our country is prepared to examine this question in the general context of limiting and ending the nuclear arms race.

In the same context, another aspect is gaining particular resonance. The idea of a mutual freeze on nuclear arsenals as the first step on the path to reducing and ultimately totally eliminating them is close to the Soviet Union's proposals with respect to nuclear weapons constitute a well thought-out, integral program of measures with the eventual goal of excluding the very possibility of nuclear catastrophe. And such measures -- this should be stressed -- are quite feasible in practice. It is only necessary for adequate political will to be displayed by the other nuclear powers.

If anyone believes in the myth of the Soviet Union's aggressiveness, let them take another look at the solemn statement made in L.I. Brezhnev's message. Let them place it alongside other Soviet initiatives, in particular the Soviet Union's proposal on concluding a world treaty on the nonuse of force in international realtions. Let them recall that the USSR and its Warsaw Pact allies have proposed that agreement also be reached on not being the first to use either nuclear or conventional weapons in Europe. This last proposal strikes directly at the "argument" cited by NATO strategists: Nuclear weapons, they say, are necessary to safeguard ourselves against an attack using conventional armaments. In contact with reality, inventions about the "Soviet military threat" collapse into ashes. The Soviet Union threatens no state on any continent.

When the Soviet Union pledges not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, that certainly helps to increase the level of confidence in relations between states. This is of special significance in the present international situation. When confidence has been substantially undermined by those who are trying to wreck the existing equilibrium of forces, secure military superiority over the Soviet Union and derail the positive elements in the detente policy -- those who call for the start of a "crusade" against communism. Will the Western capitals, where they are not averse to expatiating on the need for confidence in international affairs, respond to the Soviet Union's initiative with equally constructive, farreaching steps? From ancient times, states' policies have been judged not by peacemaking rhetoric but by practical actions.

Mankind's creative and technical genius has scaled great heights. Today, if the achievements of scientific and technical progress were directed solely toward peaceful needs, the peoples could rise to a new level of development and cope successfully with problems affecting all mankind, such as the struggle against hunger, disease and poverty. The Soviet Union's proposal opens up new prospects for ensuring that nuclear power serves exclusively the goals of peace, cooperation and development.

There is every reason to suppose that the Soviet Union's new foreign policy initiative has, so to speak, hit the nail on the head. Even before it was announced, a number of countries had appealed, in the course of the second UN General Assembly special session on disarmament, for the nuclear states to make a pledge on not being the first to use nuclear weapons, to freeze nuclear arsenals and to immediately commence talks on nuclear disarmament. This was advocated, in particular, by Mexican Foreign Minister Castaneda, who expressed the sentiments of most of the nonaligned countries, and by Swedish Prime Minister Falldin and others.

When L.I. Brezhnev's message was read out and the Soviet Union's pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons became a fait accompli, this aroused a broad, positive response. The first reactions show that the peoples are giving due credit for the consistent, peace-loving nature of Soviet foreign policy and the persistence with which the Soviet Union strives for the goals of peace in the international arena.

Our country has once again convincingly demonstrated that it does everything in its power to halt the endless buildup of increasingly destructive types of weapons and prevent nuclear catastrophe. As was declared from the lofty platform of the UN General Assembly, the Soviet Union calls on all other states to do the same.

BLOKHIN REPORTS TO UN ON NUCLEAR WAR EFFECTS

LD290728 Moscow TASS in English 0630 GMT 29 Jun 82

[Text] New York June 29 TASS -- The second special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament opened the discussion of the specific proposals for curbing the arms race, submitted by delegations, and also began drafting the final documents. The discussions take place in working groups and in the special committee of the session whose members are the delegations of all states represented at the forum.

Speaking in the committee, Academician N.N. Blokhin, member of the Soviet delegation, expressed gratitude to the representatives of the countries who had highly valued the Soviet Union's commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. He emphasised that this initiative was a major step along the road of preventing a nuclear catastrophe.

The participants in the session closely listened to the report by the Soviet scientist on the possible consequences of a nuclear conflict. The bloody pictures of victims of the Israeli invasion of Lebanon have horrified the world, he said. But they cannot even be compared with the results of a possible nuclear war to the world.

Even the tremendous destruction in Hiroshima and Nagasaki resulting from the blasts of the American atom bombs do not give an idea of the scope of the tragedy which could happen on earth. Estimates of scientists show that the explosion of a one megaton bomb over a town with a million population would immediately kill 350,000 people. The same number would be seriously injured -- burns and fractures and large dosages of radiation emission. The mushroom cloud after the explosion would lift into the atmosphere about a million tons of broken reinforced concerete, brick and soil and all this would again hit back at the town.

To speak in present-day conditions of the possibility of "limited" nuclear war and of "victory" in such a war, the Soviet scientist pointed out, would be an unjustifiable fraud. The Soviet Union regards it as a priority task to liquidate even the possibility of a nuclear clash, he emphasised.

In the opinion of India's delegate A.R. Venkateswaran, the very first duty of states to their peoples is to guarantee their survival. The very idea of using nuclear weapons utterly contradicted the spirit of the United Nations Charter, he emphasised.

Inga Torsson, Sweden's secretary of state for disarmament, spoke in support of a freeze on nuclear arsenals. She said it was an amazing fact that some countries regarded this idea as "contradictory".

S. Yashpal (India), the secretary general of the second United Nations conference on the peaceful uses of outer space, also stressed the need of taking urgent steps to prevent the extension of the arms race to outer space.

PRAVDA DETAILS PEACE DEMONSTRATIONS IN USSR

PM241557 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 82 p 5

[S. Timofeyeva article: "Protest of Millions"]

[Text] The mass demonstrations timed to coincide with the second UN General Assembly special session on disarmament taking place in New York are developing widely and vigorously in the Soviet Union.

In these June days millions of young people, workers and employees, and rural workers of all the fraternal republics of the land of the soviets are expressing their unswerving desire for lasting peace on earth.

Thus meetings and demonstrations by young people have taken place in Dnepropetrovsk's Zhovtnevoy Rayon and the Siberian city of Omsk. The working people of the Kazakh SSR's Pavlodarskaya Oblast have joined the guard of peace by transferring their wages to the Soviet peace fund. Crowded meetings have taken place at the ornaments and souvenirs plant in the capital of Buratiya, Ulan-Ude, at the Moscow printing works, and on kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the Artashatskiy, Oktemberyanskiy and Echimadzhinskiy Rayons of sunny Armenia. A scientific practice conference on the sujbect "the 26th CPSU Congress and the tasks of further enhancing the public's role in the struggle for peace" has been held in Brest. This list could be extended further and still further.

Soviet people are protesting angrily against the arms race which is continuing through the fault of the NATO and U.S. militarists and which is diverting increasingly large funds from peaceful creation and presenting a mortal threat to mankind.

In individual speeches and collective resolutions the participants in the demonstrations are denouncing the aggressive actions of imperialism in the South Atlantic and the Near East and declaring their solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of El Salvador and Namibia.

Everywhere appeals are being heard calling on the U.S. administration to heed the USSR's peace proposals and seek at the conference table mutually acceptable paths toward reducing nuclear arsenals.

The multinational Soviet people are expressing their unanimous support for the foreign policy course of the CPSU and the Soviet Government aimed at preserving detente, preventing nuclear catastrophe and attaining universal and complete disarmanent.

INTERNATIONAL SITUATION -- QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

LD251544 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 25 Jun 82

["International Situation -- Questions and Answers" program presented by Valeriy Kosovan, all-union radio foreign-political commentator, with Konstantin Ivanovich Semenov, candidate of history and Yuriy Vasilyevich Glukhov, PRAVDA observer]

Nuclear Arms Stance

[Excerpts] [Kosovan] Many of our listeners have sent in letters with questions about the new Soviet initiatives put forward from the podium of the second special session of the United Nations General Assembly on disarmament. They were set out in Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's message to the participants in the international forum. The authors of the letters among whom are Petr Igorovich Kibo from Voroshilovgradsk, Yakov Tikhonovich Makarov from the settlement of Krivozerye, Penzenskay Oblast, Kuterov from Riga and Vasilyev from Leningrad, ask about the reaction which has been aroused in the world by Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's message.

Tom Wicker, observer of the U.S. newspaper New York TIMES writes: The Soviet Union has gained a great political advantage by pledging not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. The declaration by the Soviet leader might turn out to be more significant than the State Department allows, the U.S. journalist concludes. It is appropriate here to ask what is the reaction of the White House to the Soviet proposal.

President Reagan has not said a word about this. This was done for him by representatives of the State Department who referred journalists to the statement by Secretary of State Haig of 6 April. It says: A refusal to be the first to use nuclear weapons is equivalent to an invitation for an attack on Europe by conventional means. In other words, under the pretext of a routine so-called "lagging behind," this time in the size of conventional weapons of NATO forces, the United States, just as it did two decades ago, is planning a nuclear war in Europe. And this, naturally cannot but arouse legitimate alarm and primarily among the inhabitants of Europe. But here we are already moving on to the second theme of our broadcast.

'Crisis in NATO'

A group of questions which have come into the editorial office in the past few days touch on the problems of the growing disagreements between the United States and Western Europe. Muscovite Ivan Stepanovich Terepanov asks, for example, in what specific ways are the inter-imperialist contradictions which are now deepening the crisis in NATO being demonstrated and what are the reasons for them. We have shown these letters and others on the same theme to Semenov, candidate of history. Konstantin Ivanovich, will you please tell our listeners about the crisis phenomena in the Western alliance and the real state of affairs there.

[Semenov] Valeriy Ivanovich, I think it is apt to quote some Western voices. Thus, the magazine of U.S. business circles, BUSINESS WEEK writes, and I quote: If any process is going on in NATO then it is the process of disintegration. The alliance is growing weaker under the influence of mutual suspicious, economic conflicts and different political motives in different countries. The point of this quote is to show that the crisis in NATO is an objective process in which, one might say, all the NATO countries are to blame. Here is the no less influential organ of the U.S. finance capital, WALL STREET JOURNAL. Quote: The main reason for the noneffectiveness of NATO is that a superpower cannot weld an alliance, especially during a long period of peace. A superpower constantly undermines its real status. If a superpower rules openly, as is actually the case, it is said that it is irresponsible. But if the superpower acts unnoticed it loses trust. The author of this article is an isolationist. He complains about the burden of an imperialist superpower. At the same time he is not opposed to intimidating the United States' European allies. Look, Washington might go and stop the game of equality for the United States is a superpower.

These voices from the other side show that the West is no longer determined to deny the crisis in NATO. It has become a generally accepted fact.

[Kosovan] Konstantin Ivanovich, even from these two quotes something else can be seen. The views about the reasons for this crisis are fairly wide apart.

[Semenov] That is true. It is noteworthy only that American authors as a rule avoid revealing the real reasons for the crisis in NATO. Let us take a serious political document such as the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee published about 2 months ago. At first glance the report seems to give an objective analysis. Here is a quote: To a certain extent the crisis in the West can be ascribed to a weakness in leadership on both sides of the Atlantic. But the roots of the crisis are deeper. One of its most important sources is the difference of views between the United States and Western Europe on East-West relations. And the report goes on to ennumerate the individual factors from which this difference is made up. Among these are the increased independence of Western European states, their unwillingness to regard the United States as a model for emulation, their readiness to regard the Soviet Union as a partner and not an opponent. The report also notes the circumstance that Western Europe has received tangible advantages from detente and does not intend to give them up easily. It even says, and I quote: The policy of direct confrontation with the East involves much greater human and financial costs for a country such as the FRG than for the United States.

However, we are right to assert that the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee stopped at the point where in fact the real reasons for the crisis in NATO begin.

[Kosovan] Konstantin Ivanovich, of course, the imperialists do not like to talk about their economic interests. But it is precisely these which motivate their policies.

[Semenov] The 26th CPSU Congress pointed out the aggravation of the inter-imperialist contradictions, the intensification of the struggle for markets, for sources of raw material and power, the competitive struggle between the monopolies of Western Europe and American capital as the reasons for the difficulties which capitalism is experiencing, including the difficulties in the sphere of foreign policy. Therefore, to search for all the reasons for the NATO crisis in the different approaches of Washington and the majority of West European capitals to the questions of relations with the Soviet Union is seriously to distort the true picture. Yes, the difference in approach is obvious. Yes, it has an effect on the situation in NATO. But the inter-imperialist contradictions have their own nature. The unwillingness of the West European peoples to sacrifice their own interests to benefit the aggressive course of the American administration also has its own nature.

[Kosovan] Konstantin Ivanovich, it is probably necessary to explain this idea with specific examples.

[Semenov] Certainly. Here is one such example: The high U.S. interest rates making credit expensive in the United States have no connection with the question of relations with the USSR. But they are causing colossal damage to the economic interests of the Western European states, especially to the FRG. West European capital is flowing rapidly to the United States. The West European states are losing capital investment and jobs. In other words, the crisis in the American economy is being transferred onto the United States' allies. But the U.S. administration is stubbornly rejecting all protests from its allies about this. And the level of dramatics of these protests can be seen for example, by the following words from West German chancellor, Helmut Schmidt, who stated recently that at the present stage the specter of high interest rates is for him in many respects no less alarming than the threat of nuclear war.

[Kosovan] Konstantin Ivanovich, what influence are Washington's strategies having on the processes within NATO?

[Semenov] The population of Western Europe is shocked by the American scenarios which are based on the possibilities of a nuclear conflict confined to the framework of Europe. There are increasing demonstrations against the U.S. plans to deploy here new U.S. medium-range nuclear weapons. An explosion of indignation was caused by Reagan's decision to produce new chemical weapons. The already existing stockpiles of chemical weapons horrify people.

According to the U.S. Congressman Clement Zablocki, these stockpiles are sufficient, quote, for 50 divisions to conduct chemical warfare for 100 days and then, at the end of that period, hardly a single creature would remain alive in Europe. It is understandable that the picture of a destroyed Western Europe, presented to the mental view of its inhabitants against the background of an untouched United States, does not strengthen the idea of the unity of the West.

President Reagan, worried by the centrifugal phenomena in NATO, used his recent 10-day trip to Europe in order to impose discipline among the allies. The American magazine U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT summed up the results of these efforts by saying: During the tiring trip which demanded maximum effort from President Reagan he asked our friends for relatively little. However, their response cannot be called satisfactory.

In conclusion, I shall quote Henry Kissinger, former U.S. secretary of state. At the beginning of this year he stated: In our days it is difficult to find any potential hotbed of crisis in the world where the United States and its West European allies will not act against each other. If the absence of unity is not brought to an end, Kissinger said, this might lead to the disintegration of NATO.

[Kosovan] Thank you, Konstantin Ivanovich. Of course, one does not have to be a prophet to foresee a further rise in disagreements in NATO because the course of events in the world is revealing more and more new divergences of interests between the Reagan government and the majority of West European countries.

Kampuchean Situation

A Muscovite, Valentin Ivanovich Kosnin, asks us to tell the details of a recent event in Southeast Asia: the forming of the so-called coalition government of Democratic Kampuchea. We have already spoken in our program about the provocative fuss made about the Washington- and Beijing-inspired Kampuchean question. This week, more precisely on Tuesday, in the capital of Malaysia, an agreement was signed on the creation of a coalition of the three main groups of traitors to the Kampuchean people, in effect a government in exile.

And so the coalition has been created. Sihanouk receives the post of president, Son San is the prime minister of this nonexistent government. For a whole year, Beijing, Washington and those in the countries of Southeast Asia who think the same way, have been working to bring this plan to fruition. The question arises: What have they achieved by it? No one, of course, thinks that the emigrant rabble is going to ride into Phnom Penh, the Kampuchean capital, on white horses to take charge of the fate of the Kampuchean people. They know very well in the United States, China and the ASEAN countries that the legitimate government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea is in firm control of the situation in the country and will not give up an inch of their soil to the ill-assorted coalitionists, as they are called. But it seems to me that this unrealistic aim was never set. The aim of Washington and Beijing is to whip up tension over the so-called Kampuchean question, so as to make stronger the position of the Pol Pot supporters illegally holding the Kampuchean chair at the United Nations and to legitimize their military assistance to the anti-Kampuchean groups. The ASEAN member-states have also been dragged into this provocative fuss. It should be said that just now, in these countries, there is an increasing feeling in favor of a dialogue with the Indochinese countries, including the People's Republic of Kampuchea, and establishing an atmosphere of trust, good-neighborliness and cooperation in Southeast Asia; and I am convinced that in the end this feeling will prevail.

Near East 'Tragedy'

[Kosovan] The next letter is from a Muscovite, Ivan Alekseyevich (Ferel). He writes that while the whole world is shuddering at the crimes of Tel Aviv in Lebanon, Washington remains totally indifferent to the Near East tragedy. In this connection many of our listeners ask us to tell of the aims pursued by Washington in arming Israel to the teeth and encouraging it to fresh aggression. Your questions, esteemed listeners, will be answered by PRAVDA observer Yuriy Vasilyevich Glukhov.

Yuriy Vasilyevich, a good place to begin our talk would be with the question: How was Washington's position demonstrated during the recently completed visit of Israeli Prime Minister Begin to Washington? As is known, he met with U.S. Secretary of State Haig and President Reagan.

[Glukhov] It should be said, Valery Ivanovich, that the Washington administration found not a single word of condemnation for the rampant aggressor. Not at all! After all, the United States bears full responsibility for Tel Aviv's outrages. As the British paper THE GUARDIAN writes, the impending Israeli attack was known beforehand to the West, since for several days Israel had been pouring more and more reinforcements and military equipment into the occupied part of south Lebanon. This was well known in Washington. Furthermore, none other than U.S. President Reagan blessed the aggressive actions of the Israeli military, when he wrote to Israeli Prime Minister Begin on the eve of Israel's invasion of Lebanon: As you know, Israel's security continues to be my first concern. But no one was threatening Israel's security. On the contrary, it was Israel which was and is threatening the territorial integrity, independence and sovereignty of the Arab states. It is ready to trample on the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine. Why was the American President concerned? Only that Israel should continue its aggressive course.

[Kosovan] Yuriy Vasilyevich, the United States has already more than once, it might be said, had Lebanon in its sights. After all, it was not only today that the Lebanese crisis arose.

[Glukhov] It has a long history, connected with continuous American interference. We may recall the well-known Eisenhower Doctrine, adopted by the United States in January 1957. It was used to legitimize American interference in the affairs of Near East countries under the pretext of struggling against the so-called threat of communism. In 1958 this doctrine was applied. The United States perpetrated an armed intervention in Lebanon, and although the diversion of 1958 ended in failure, it was picked up by Israel, which repeatedly terrorized Lebanon.

In the February 1981 edition of the British journal MIDDLE EAST, it was reported that there might be a new outbreak of military operations in connection with the election of Ronald Reagan as U.S. President. It is precisely since he came to power that there has been a further deterioration in the situation in the Near East and the use of forcible methods by the United States in implementing its plan. The United States and Israel intended to strike their main blow at the Palestinians, to give impetus to the progress of the Camp David deals. But since Lebanon -- MIDDLE EAST predicted -- is the only remaining bastion where the Palestinians are concentrated in the political and military senses, the critical battle will have to take place on Lebanese soil. Reliance was placed on an invasion of the Lebanon by Israel and the coordination of its actions with the Lebanese rightwing Christian forces, in order to bring a regime to the liking of the West to power in that country. This is just what is happening now.

[Kosovan] Excuse me, Yuriy Vasilyevich, surely here we should dwell on another aspect. As is known, not long before Israel invaded Lebanon, the doors of the American arsenals were flung wide open to it. Tel Aviv's military credits were increased by $300 million, delivery of 75 additional F-16 fighter-bombers was approved -- the same F-16's which are today destroying everything living on Lebanese soil. Israeli Defense Minister Sharon, who visited Washington, clearly coordinated his plan of military operations with his colleagues in the Pentagon.

[Glukhov] I should like to remind our listeners in this connection that a memorandum on strategic cooperation has been signed between the United States and Israel. This provides for the coordination of militarist actions by Tel Aviv and Washington. The sides are obliged to give each other assistance in the backup of their operations in this region, to hold joint naval and air force exercises. The Pentagon reserves the right to make use of Israeli territory as a bridgehead, repair base and weapons stockpile. The memorandum also provides for setting up a coordination council of the defense ministers of the two countries.

It looks as though the latest meetings between Israeli Defense Minister Sharon and Pentagon boss Weinberger amounted in fact to a session of this coordination council.

It was while these meetings were taking place that Israeli aircraft invaded Lebanese airspace and shot down two Syrian aircraft. The signal was given to begin a wide-scale operation, which means that the Pentagon virtually became the headquarters of Israel's aggression.

Whereas quite recently, the United States recalled a law which bans delivery of weapons to Israel for offensive purposes, and sighed hypocritically about breaches of it, now when Israel's military is taking barbarous vengeance on the Lebanese and Palestinians this is never even mentioned. According to the American journal TIME, Israel is providing American military leaders and industrialists with a unique opportunity, a laboratory in which during four Near East wars the latest weapons and electronic systems have been tested in battle conditions. Now the fifth war is in progress. Lebanon has become another such testing ground.

The latest act in the Lebanon tragedy is a continuation of Camp David. The U.S.-made Camp David separatist deal took Egypt out of the ranks of the fighters against Israeli aggression. It secured a quiet rear for the Israeli military and increased their predatory appetites. Now it is the turn for Lebanon and the Palestinian lands. With this aim Tel Aviv is trying to drown the Palestinian Resistance Movement in blood, to remove from the agenda the creation of an independent Palestinian state and to force autonomy within the framework of Israeli occupation on the Palestinians. The United States and Israel, exerting military pressure on Lebanon, are clearly reckoning on having this country, too, accede to the Camp David deal. A plan is being implemented to disunite the Arab states, to weaken their ranks, as planned at Camp David.

[Kosovan] Yes, this is so, Yuriy Vasilyevich. But meanwhile, under cover of the Lebanese events, the Pentagon is strengthening its positions in the Near East. U.S. naval forces totaling 52 ships have been sent there; Secretary of State Haig has proposed the idea of stationing multinational forces on Lebanese soil on the model of Sinai.

[Glukhov] This is a strike detachment of the American gendarme Rapid Deployment Force. The United States and Israel reckon on imposing conditions amounting to capitulation on other countries, too. The paper New York TIMES wrote recently: We should say to the king of Jordan that it is now time for him to join in the Camp David peace agreements. We should also tell the Saudis that the time has now come for them to take practical steps to demonstrate their moderation, of which they have spoken for a long time, but which we rarely see. Thus, encouraging Israel's aggression in Lebanon, the United States is pursuing far-reaching aims. By the hands of the Israeli interventionists, it would like to clear a new bridgehead for American imperialism in the Near East.

LEBANON, FALKLAND ISLANDS HOSTILITIES COMPARED

PM280837 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 20 Jun 82 p 3

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA international observer V. Pustov "Military-Political Review": "Washington Behind the Aggressors"]

[Text] The blaze of the criminal war unleashed by Israel continues to rage in Lebanon. Defying the international community, the Tel Aviv rulers have refused to comply with the UN Security Council demand to immediately withdraw their troops from that country. They prefer a different call, that issued by the U.S. President in the British Parliament recently: "Let's not hesitate! Let's use our might!" The Israeli aggressors decided -- not without justification -- that the White House incumbent's bellicose cry had a direct relevance to themselves, the U.S. trusted ally in the Near East, especially since, as Defense Minister Sharon admitted, the U.S. administration had "provided Israel with the necessary means" to destroy the Palestinians.

The armed invasion of Lebanon has been undertaken in full accordance with plans long since hatched in the United States and Israel. The plans envisage first destroying the force on whose activity the Palestinian people pin their hopes for the creation of their own independent state -- the Palestinian Resistance Movement.

It was supposed that the conditions would thus be created for moving on to the second stage of the Camp David deal, during which "administrative autonomy," which would mean virtual annexation, would be foisted on the Palestinians in the Israeli-occupied Arab lands.

The Israeli aggression also aims, by striking a blow against Lebanon and relying on the support of reactionary Lebanese separatists, to install in power in that country a regime which suits Washington and Tel Aviv and to foist on it separate talks with Israel to conclude another treaty on the capitulationist Camp David basis. But even that is not all. Attempts are being made to subordinate the Arab countries, one after another, to imperialist diktat. The gamble here is on disunity among the Arabs and on their being unable to pool their efforts to help the latest victim of aggression.

The Israeli troops which have invaded Lebanon now number 100,000 men. There is no need to describe again the course of the combat operations, reports on which are published daily in the press. However, it must be noted that the interventionists have met with stubborn opposition from the united forces of the Palestinian Resistance Movement and Lebanon's National Patriotic Forces, which number approximately 12,000 men. Despite the great superiority in forces and the extensive use by the aggressor of such barbarous means of destruction as ball-bearing and cluster bombs, his occupation of southern Lebanon has cost him dearly, which even Western observers admit. The Palestinians, a French television commentator stresses, are fighting staunchly, even inside the zones which Israel has seized. At many points surrounded by the enemy, the patriots have fought to the last man. The British BBC has reported considerable losses among the Israeli interventionists.

However, neither the losses nor the angry protests of the world public stop those who control Israel's policy and their transatlantic bosses. In a militarist fever, playing with fire, the rampant aggressor is ready to destabilize the international situation as a whole. "Let us not be reproached for jeopardizing world peace!" a top Israeli officer declared with unprecedented impudence to the French weekly VSD. "We decided quite consciously to take the risk, because we are far from being the only ones to act in this way." And in his "justification" of the Israeli criminal action he alluded to another -- to Britain's colonial adventure in the South Atlantic.

It is noteworthy that Israel's aggression in Lebanon coincided with a sharp intensification of the British Expeditionary Corps' operations in the South Atlantic. Both actions are striking evidence that armed conflicts and dangerous centers of international tension do not arise spontaneously. They are created by bellicose imperialist forces that are ready to commit any crime for the sake of implementing their expansionist plans and imperial ambitions. And it is no mere chance that a number of analogies can be seen between the aggressive actions in the Near East and the South Atlantic.

Firstly, both Israel and Britain rely on the broad support of the United States. As the Argentinian newspaper CLARIN notes, the same "protective wing" which was extended over the reemergence of British colonialism in the South Atlantic also covers Israel's intervention in Lebanon. Washington's complicity in the criminal deeds has guaranteed the Israeli and British aggressors not only an overwhelming superiority in forces; it has also inspired them to the most flagrant flouting of the generally accepted norms of international law, and has inspired the Israeli aggressors to the criminal act of genocide, too. "Begin," the London newspaper THE GUARDIAN reports, "gave the order to reduce Sayda to ashes, and the city was destroyed." The same fate awaited many other Lebanese population centers too. And how many refugees -- old people, women and children -- died on the roads in the barbaric raids by the Israeli Air Force or from the fire of artillery and tanks?!

Secondly, both in the Near East and in the South Atlantic, the mailed fist of the aggressors is paving the way for the transatlantic patron and ally, which in fact explains his help to the aggressors.

High-ranking Israeli officials, the Washington POST reports, declared that the results of the invasion of Lebanon are of "tremendous strategic significance for the U.S. role in the Near East" and that they "have provided the keagan administration with a unique opportunity to increase its influence in the region."

Striving to make the most of the fruits of aggression, the United States and Israel are hatching plans for the creation in Lebanon of notorious "multinational forces," with U.S. troops predominating. Revealing their own plans and those of the Pentagon, representatives of the Israeli command demand that these forces be "much larger than those which are now in Sinai." Thus, in addition to the U.S. naval armada in the Indian Ocean and the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean, the interventionist U.S. Rapid Deployment Force would be deployed on a permanent basis no longer in one but in two Near East regions. The threat to the security of the Arab countries would become even more real.

As for the South Atlantic, Washington does not conceal its interest in the creation of a major British military base on the Falklands, which Prime Minister M. Thatcher has announced. This base could be used in the interests of the Pentagon and the NATO bloc, whose sphere of operation the United States is striving to extend to the South Atlantic. The base could also be an important strongpoint of a NATO subsidiary, a South Atlantic bloc (SATO), the idea of creating which has long been nurtured by U.S. strategists.

Finally, in the purely military-technical regard, the Pentagon strategists with cynical frankness regard Lebanon and the South Atlantic as a testing ground where various types of new weaponry, primarily American, have been tried out "in action." In the process additional "arguments" are being advanced in favor of a further twist in the arms race spiral. The sinking of modern British ships in the South Atlantic has aggravated arguments about what sort of aircraft carriers and ships of other classes -- large or small -- should be emphasized in implementing the grandiose naval program. The results of the combat use of aviation have intensified the battles between the supporters of building costly supermodern planes and those who advocate acquiring cheaper planes but in large quantity.

Military specialists in the Pentagon, a correspondent of the French newspaper LE QUOTIDIEN DE PARIS reports from Washington, "express joy at the efficiency of the planes and other combat equipment acquired by Israel mainly from the United States." This is joy at thousands of people killed and maimed with weapons stamped "made in USA". It blatantly shows the worth of the hypocritical attempts of the U.S. administration to pose as a champion of human rights and its flagrant scorn for people's basic right -- the right to life.

The peoples of the Arab East and Latin America have once again seen with their own eyes who is guiding the criminal hand of the aggressor. This indignation and protests resound with a hollow echo in the United States. Thus sober-minded observers in the United States note that the bloody atrocities being committed by the Israeli occupiers with Washington's help are resulting in an intensification of anti-Americanism in the Arab world. Indignation at the policy of the United States, which sided with London in the Anglo-Argentine conflict, is also growing in Latin America.

The world public resolutely advocates eliminating the centers of international conflict being kindled by the aggressive forces of imperialism.

The Soviet Government statement which stresses that the USSR is on the side of the Arabs not in words but in deeds and is trying to get the aggressor to leave Lebanon has met with great attention and approval abroad. As a result of the Israeli aggression carried out with the framework of the so-called "strategic cooperation" between Tel Aviv and Washington, the Near East has been transformed into an even more dangerous center of international tension. Israel's rulers have been warned that this region lies in the immediate vicinity of the southern borders of the Soviet Union and events there cannot fail to affect USSR interests.

Israel's impertinent aggression must be stopped -- this is the resolute demand of all who cherish peace and international security.

IZVESTIYA ON UK REACTION TO END OF FALKLANDS WAR

PM281005 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 82 Morning Edition p 5

[Correspondent V. Skosyrev's "Letter From London": "To the Thunder of Fanfares"]

[Text] The news of the cease-fire in the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands has been greeted with relief in Britain. But what now? Will the task force return home, or will it be saddled with the burden of acting as a policeman on an endless watch thousands of miles from home? The British wonder. Official statements from London in the last few days are quite incapable of dispelling the alarm and doubts about this.

The Tories present the taking of Port Stanley as the greatest victory for British might since World War II. The tone of bellicose ballyhoo was set by the prime minister herself, who proclaimed in the House of Commons, to exultant cries from her confederates: "British rule (in the islands) has been restored." Following the head of government, the Fleet Street press set about extolling the British troops' successes.

The thunder of fanfares is preventing the ordinary Briton from evaluating the situation objectively. But the more time that passes since the day hostilities ceased, the more obvious becomes the indisputable fact that the surrender of the Argentine garrison does not mean the end of the conflict, and the question of sovereignty over the islands has by no means been removed from the agenda. Buenos Aires declares that Argentina will never renounce its historical rights to the Malvinas, which have been repeatedly confirmed by UN General Assembly resolutions.

Analyzing the recent events, THE GUARDIAN, the only one of the "big" newspapers to speak out against military escalation, admits that the confrontation is not over. In order to prevent decolonization London will have to turn the archipelago into a fortress bristling with gun barrels. According to press estimates, a garrison of 3,000 soldiers will be permanently stationed there.

If you take account of the fact that the civilian population totaled only approximately 1,800 before the beginning of the crisis, it becomes clear that the role of yet another British overseas military base, whose upkeep will cost the Treasury 100,000 pounds sterling annually, is in fact being prepared for the Falklands. In addition, it will cost 20 million pounds to extend the runway at Port Stanley airport -- the British command intends to secure for itself the possibility of transferring reinforcements to the South Atlantic at any moment.

Given the present economic depression, you might think that Whitehall should avoid steps which threaten to overload still more the already strained budget. But the government has rejected out of hand both the Labor opposition's proposals to involve the United Nations in administering the Falklands and an appeal to take into consideration Security Council resolution 502, which provides for holding talks with Argentina on the islands' future. It can be seen from M. Thatcher's speech in the House of Commons that compromise variants do not suit the Conservative leadership -- it intends to return the archipelago to full colonial status.

Such a tough stand displeases not only Britain's Common Market partners but also Washington, which is concerned at the fall in its influence in Latin America. However, the prime minister is convinced that the disagreements with the Americans will easily be settled during her transatlantic visit -- for the U.S. administration, like the leaders of other North Atlantic states, is perfectly well aware that Britain waged war in the name of the West's common interests. Argentina was disobedient, it is said, by daring to challenge a NATO country, and so it must be taught a lesson so as to teach a lesson to all other developing states.

Such is the logic of imperialist "solidarity", graphically manifested in deliveries of American military hardware and intelligence information to Britain at the height of the hostilities. It is with good reason that the Tories are counting on NATO support at the present stage of the crisis, too.

When shells were bursting in the islands, the British military censorship was extremely scrupulous about rationing news of British losses. Now the television has been permitted to show the mass burial of the landing force members who died during the offensive on Port Stanley. The final tally of dead Britons has also been published: 255 men. Official propaganda maintains that they did not give their lives in vain, and thanks to them Britain is once again being called great.

One could, of course, be astounded at the cynical disregard for human life for political purposes. But the fact remains that not only the ruling class here is nostalgic for the imperial past. After sending the armada to Argentina's shores the Tory party began picking up points in public opinion polls, and whereas some 4 months ago newspapers were predicting defeat for the Conservatives in the next parliamentary election, today the Tories' share is being quoted above their rivals. These are the Gallup Institute's figures: 45 percent of the electorate would now vote for the Tories, 25 percent for Labor and 25 percent for the Liberal-Social Democratic alliance.

Changes have also occurred in the dispostion of forces inside the ruling party -- the positions of its rightwing have strengthened still further. Through their mouthpiece -- THE DAILY TELEGRAPH -- the hawks orate: "We must set an example to the whole of West Europe in increasing military spending and increase it not only by 3 percent annually, as the NATO Council envisaged, but by 4 percent. Otherwise, Britain will find itself unable in the future to equip a new military expedition to the South Atlantic or any other remote region where a threat arises to its overseas possessions."

The country's leftwing and democratic circles understand that London's present strategy in the South Atlantic is fraught with dangerous consequences. "Even having suffered defeat, Argentina will continue the struggle. Sooner or later, like the Americans previously in Southeast Asia, we will have to pay an exorbitant price for the Falkland adventure. The government has bitten off more than we can chew," Member of Parliament T. Dalyell said. The fears expressed by this well-known Labor figure are shared by thousands of Britons.

Meanwhile, alarming reports are issuing from the Falklands. The Argentine soldiers who have laid down their arms, who number approximately 5,000, are suffering from hunger and the winter cold. Some of them are on the runway at Port Stanley airport, while others have been escorted to British ships. It is also known that London has sent a dispatch to Buenos Aires through an intermediary with roughly the following contents: Prisoners of war on the islands will start dying of disease unless a total cessation of hostilities is announced. As the MORNING STAR points out, in the hands of British politicians the prisoners of war have become pawns in the haggling for advantageous terms for a settlement of the crisis.

BACKGROUND OF HAIG RESIGNATION SCRUTINIZED

Kolesnichenko Dispatch

PM281433 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 82 p 5

[Correspondent T. Kolesnichenko dispatch: "Haig's Resignation"]

[Text] New York, 26 Jun -- The White House has announced the resignation of U.S. Secretary of State A. Haig. George Shultz has been appointed to replace him as leader of the U.S. foreign policy department. Shultz was formerly chairman of the President's Consultative Committee on Economic Policy, is head of the Bechtel Corporation and was formerly secretary of the Treasury in the Nixon administration.

The President refused to answer journalists' questions as to the reasons for the secretary of state's resignation. A. Haig himself, in a press statement, gave as the reason for his resignation a difference of opinion with the administration over foreign policy. He said that U.S. policy has recently begun to deviate from the course he had elaborated with the President.

The news from Washington was a bombshell. When President R. Reagan, who had summoned journalists for 15 minutes, began to read out to them the statement in which he announced "with great regret the resignation of a member of our administration," none of the press representatives had any idea, until the moment at the very end when A. Haig's name was mentioned, that it was the secretary of state who was involved.

Yet there were more than enough reasons for the resignation. And although local commentators are emphasizing the personal differences between A. Haig and the White House entourage, including his chief, the secretary of state's "lack of diplomacy" and his style of conduct and high ambitions, the scandal which has broken out in Washington's corridors of power reflects primarily the crisis of the administration's foreign policy. This crisis has recently been increasingly in evidence, undermining confidence in U.S. policy on a broad spectrum of international problems and generating open dissatisfaction both abroad and within the country.

Let us cite just a few circumstances: The growing gulf between the United States and West Europe, which was fully revealed during the President's recent trip and particularly in connection with the administration's attempt, through the extension of sanctions to U.S. subsidiaries and foreign companies, to break business and economic cooperation between East and West; the intensification of the contradictions between the United States and Latin America in connection with Washington's ostentatious support for the British military adventure in the South Atlantic; direct U.S. responsibility for the genocide which the Israeli aggressors are perpetrating in Lebanon. And finally -- although this is undoubtedly the most important reason for the crisis in U.S. policy -- Washington's escalation of the arms race and the administration's dangerous course which -- states the resolution of a just-ended Democratic Party conference in Philadelphia -- "is leading to the risk of nuclear war."

In these circumstances President Reagan -- who, according to public opinion polls, has recently been losing "points" drastically -- needed a "scapegoat." And this scapegoat was the secretary of state, who bears the main responsibility for formulating foreign policy. And so far this policy has been confused and inconsistent. As the New York TIMES emphasizes, "during his term in office Mr Haig has not achieved any obvious diplomatic success. Not a single major treaty or important document has been signed. On the contrary, many months have been lost in elucidating and formulating the administration's policy." Indeed, the administration has wasted 16 months merely to state its agreement to talks on strategic arms limitation and reduction. And a considerable part of the blame for that rests with A. Haig.

Some observers are now sending compliments in the wake of the departed secretary of state. He is being called a "moderate," an "experienced professional" and even virtually "West Europe's voice in Washington." Yet only recently the same observers were admitting that "there are now two defense secretaries and no secretary of state in the United States."

Ultimately it is not a question of A. Haig's personality. If, as a "professional," he did indeed try somehow to narrow the gulf between the United States and its allies and opposed the most extreme steps toward which the administration was pushed and is continuing to be pushed by the ultraright, then he did this extremely inconsistently, remaining a supporter of a policy of strength and U.S. diktat.

But life has shown once again that bellicose anti-Sovietism cannot be combined in foreign policy with the pursuit of a realistic course. Perhaps the secretary of state himself partially understood this in the end. But too late. He has been removed from the political arena by the very forces which he supported by moving like a soccer player in the administration's "team" now from the "rightwing" to the center and now back again. But politics is not soccer.

And no changes in the U.S. administration can obscure the dangerous nature and unsoundness of U.S. foreign policy for as long as it fails to heed the peoples' aspiration for peace and the elimination of military conflicts, the arms race and the threat of nuclear war.

TASS Commentator

LD281552 Moscow TASS in English 1528 GMT 28 Jun 82

["Haig's Resignation: Why?" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS -- TASS commentator Yuriy Kornilov writes:

So a top-level shake-up took place in Washington: The secretary of state, Alexander Haig, the man who was considered -- not without good reason — one of the architects of Washington's present policy, has resigned after stating that he is quitting because of disagreements with the administration over foreign policy which, he said, has been deviating lately from the course charted by him together with the President.

Haig's withdrawal from the political scene, an unexpected one and having an air of scandal over it, caused a spate of commentaries in the American and world press. There is quite a lot of speculation on this score. Some (Washington POST) write about the desire of the White House to take foreign policy fully under its control. Others (the New York TIMES) say that one of the factors behind Haig's resignation is a disastrous and evergrowing "crisis of confidence" between the United States and its NATO allies. This "crisis" is due specifically to Washington's attempts to interfere with mutually-beneficial East-West economic cooperation so as to use normal commercial and economic links as an instrument of diktat and blackmail. But all agree on one thing, namely that A. Haig's resignation is evidence of bitter struggle in the American "corridors of power," a reflection of a grave crisis of Washington's foreign policy, the essence of which was once expressed by Mr Haig himself when he said that there are "things more important than peace."

And this is really so. Suffice it to look back to review the 500 or so days that have passed since "Reagan's team" took over the reins of power in Washington, to see that all this period is characterized by incessant attempts by the United States to torpedo detente, to push the world to the brink of a nuclear catastrophe, and to recarve the political map of the world. The whipping up of the arms race, the striving to upset the existing approximate parity of forces by any means, active support of the Israel aggressor, involvement in the infamous colonial campaign of the British Tories, calls for a crusade against socialist countries and hopeless attempts to put economic pressure on them -- are all components of this policy. This line, which is characterized by an irresponsible, if not adventurous, approach to serious problems affecting the destinies of mankind, is so dangerous and meets with such strong opposition from ever broader circles of the world public, the American public included, that even those who only yesterday were among the main architects of this policy are beginning to dissociate themselves from it.

To paraphrase a well-known saying, even some Washington war hawks take care today not to nest on the masts of the American political ship which sticks to its dangerous course toward greater tension and which is shaken by the surging waves of public protests and hits now and then the rocks of gross miscalculations and unrealistic appraisals.

No doubt, new details about this major shake-up in the American top echelon will come to public knowledge as time goes on. But one thing seems obvious: There is continued wrangle and confusion in the American "echelons of power" and there are persons even among this echelon who do not accept the pathological line of R. Reagan and Co., a line permeated with a spirit of militarism and the striving to destroy everything positive that was achieved with such difficulty in the international arena in recent years.

Losev Analysis

LD290156 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 28 Jun 82

[Commentary by Moscow radio's news analyst Sergey Losev]

[Text] Strictly speaking, Haig never belonged to Ronald Reagan's Californian team, and was always something of an outsider in the administration. His claims to the leading role in formulating United States foreign policy were continually challenged. And if the reports from Washington are anything to go by, Haig's resignation was brought about by policy differences not on some one problem, but on a whole series of problems. For example, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Charles Percy has voiced the view that on top of some differences on dealing with the Middle East and the Falklands crisis another dispute arose over the White House decision concerning the gas pipeline from Siberia to Western Europe. You will recall that the President's decision to ban the export of important components for this joint Soviet-West European project aroused a storm of anger in Western Europe. This compounded the differences between the United States and its allies. Secretary Haig, according to the New York TIMES, headed the group in the Cabinet that opposed the extended sanctions announced by the White House last week.

As for the reasons for Secretary Haig's stand, certainly he is no supporter of expanding American-Soviet relations. Presumably his protest was directed not so much against the substance of the President's decision on the pipeline as against its form and timing. When the step was taken, Haig was at the second disarmament session of the United Nations General Assembly. He was also having talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko. The secretary of state was not even informed of the administration's important decision, still less consulted in advance. Quite understandably, this was seen by Haig as a slap in the face, moreover publicly.

On the American political scene Haig was, to put it bluntly, a somewhat ambitious personality. His ostentatious resignation will now enable him to distance himself from the present administration and its leadership. This is prompting some people in Washington to wonder whether Haig has not made up his mind that Reagan stands no chance of being reelected for a second term in 1984. It is certainly a fact that very many people in the United States are becoming increasingly convinced that the Republican administration's policies at home and abroad are as misguided as they are dangerous. As Senator John Glenn remarked a few days ago, the administration appears to be run by people who are either simply ignoring the country's problems or else are proposing decisions that are oversimplified and superficial. Such an approach is detected by Senator Glenn in Washington's domestic and foreign policies. And internationally, in his view, such a course is fraught with a grave threat to the security not just of the United States but of the whole world.

But the President appears to be interested in one question only: Is this or that candidate for a major post in his administration sufficiently anti-Soviet? According to the New York TIMES, which cites White House officials, Mr Shultz was asked by the President before his appointment to the State Department whether he supported the President's tough line towards the Soviet Union and America's West European partners. The new secretary of state, according to the paper, replied to this question in the affirmative.

But the new secretary of state, too, will have to face up to the fact that in international affairs there is no ignoring realities. As for houses of cards like the anti-Soviet crusade proposed by President Reagan, they will remain houses of cards.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA ON U.S. ELECTRONIC ESPIONAGE

PM280829 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Jun 82 p 3

[Candidate of Technical Sciences V. Vartanesyan article: "Washington's Electronic Ear: Espionage at the Service of Aggression"]

[Text] At the end of last year U.S. President Reagan signed two executive orders, one of which, in his words, "will direct the activity of intelligence departments," while the other "will reaffirm the legality" of their operation. These presidential acts, elevated to the status of laws, are dictated by the American administration's desire to sharply step up the subversive espionage activity of the U.S. special services both in their own country and throughout the world.

According to the magazine U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, a whole family of intelligence services functions in the United States, headed by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). This "intelligence community" includes, as well as the CIA: the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the intelligence services of the ground forces, Navy and Air Force, and other special services.

American imperialism's spy network covers all countries. Using the most modern equipment (and, in particular, various microelectronic devices), U.S. intelligence organs seek to find out other states' secrets at any cost, channel their efforts into the interception of communications from diplomatic missions, listen in on radio telephone conversations between the commanders of military units, and so forth.

The range of technical facilities used by the espionage services of the United States and other Western states is extremely broad: from the simplest electronic "bugs" for tapping telephone conversations to spy satellites costing many millions of dollars.

The National Security Agency holds a special place in the overall system of global espionage. It is the main organ of electronic intelligence, with virtually unlimited financial and technical potential. All the National Security Agency's work is top secret. But information published in the foreign press makes it possible to form an impression of the impressive scale of its espionage activity. The National Security Agency's round-the-clock work costs more than $1.3 billion a year ($3.6 million every 24 hours). The headquarters staff consists of more than 14,000 people. Many of them work abroad, while tens of thousands of servicemen formally subordinate to other intelligence organs are in fact employed in the electronic intelligence sphere in the interests, and under the control, of the National Security Agency.

The National Security Agency has been compared to a giant vacuum cleaner sucking in a flow of information from the interception of all kinds of communications. "Listening," NEWSWEEK magazine notes, yields more information than "spying." Depending on the specific conditions and tasks, the American special services use various combinations of such intelligence facilities as radio, electronic intelligence and radar surveillance and make wide use of infrared, television and optical equipment and so forth.

As the magazine EPOCA wrote, it is possible, by means of electronic devices, to obtain valuable information in the interests of government organs and the top military command, to uncover state secrets and to discover the location of defense sites in the country being studied. In the opinion of observers, by intercepting the content of communications being transmitted by military radio stations and determining their structure and location by taking radio bearings on the signals, there is a realistic possibility of discovering the enemy's plans and designs and the composition and location of military units and of establishing the siting of staffs and command centers and the locations of bases, missile launching pads and so forth.

The Pentagon leaders make no secret of the fact that total electronic espionage is directed first and foremost against the Soviet Union and the socialist countries and against countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America which are following the path of independent development and social progress.

Land-based electronic intelligence work is carried out from many U.S. military bases, located in Britain, West Germany, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Norway, South Korea, Japan and so forth. American military bases and strong points are particularly numerous in Turkey. Here the main U.S. military base at Incirlik is the center of electronic espionage.

NEWSWEEK reports that some of the instruments installed at stationary land-based stations are so sensitive that they can pick up weak telephone and telegraph signals over great distances. A special place is occupied by maritime radioelectronic intelligence using submarines and surface ships -- spy ships packed with electronic equipment, with a large number of specialists on board.

Wide use is also made for espionage purposes of a network of agents in the guise of tourists, envoys from trade firms and so forth.

The achievements of modern microelectronics, including achievements in the sphere of the creation of multifunctional electronic devices -- microprocessors -- have served as the basis for the use by the special services of the United States and certain other NATO countries of portable, miniature and subminiature electronic espionage devices -- "electronic detectives" intended for use both in their own countries and on the territory of foreign states.

Spicy details of the "exploits" of the American "cloak and dagger" knights from the National Security Agency and the CIA are constantly in the pages of the Western press. London's weekly THE SUNDAY TIMES warns its readers: "Trust nobody. Every object belonging to your interlocutor is your enemy. Beware even a lump of sugar! A miniature plastic microphone, with an amazing resemblance to a lump of sugar, is indispensible for bugging institutions."

The journal goes on to talk about the microphone in the umbrella, the radio transmitter in the wristwatch, the special capsules for telephone handsets and other "dangerous devices."

The espionage carried out by imperialist intelligence services in our country and the socialist states has the aim of obtaining information which it is impossible or difficult to obtain by other types of intelligence work. The aim is to obtain information about our scientific research institutes, experimental design bureaus and enterprises working in the defense sphere and about various governmental, civil and military systems of control and communications, including radio relay, air and space radio communications lines.

Let us remember the failure of the espionage operation by CIA agents in the guise of diplomats from the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, who tried to use a portable multipurpose radio station, camouflaging it under the stump of a pine tree in the forest in the zone of radio visibility of a defense site. This radio station, as IZVESTIYA wrote, designed in the form of a globe with a diameter of 19 cm and packed with complex microelectronic equipment, was intended for radioelectronic espionage following an automatic schedule with a preset program.

It was proposed to use this "pine tree stump" to intercept radio wave signals from the defense site in the super high frequency waveband, subsequently transmitting the information collected in code form by radio both to their own artificial Earth satellites and to land-based secret radio reception centers, including the American Embassy in Moscow. It may be supposed that such camouflaged electronic intelligence devices could use other types of camouflage, and could also be used from diplomatic cars on trips around the city and outside the city.

Foreign technical literature cites descriptions of various miniature and subminiature radio devices in camouflage -- "bugs" for obtaining intelligence information by secretly picking up conversations taking place nearby, including telephone conversations sent by wire. These devices consist of a radio transmitter and microphone and are called, in foreign terminology, "radio-microphones." They can take the form of a fountain pen, matchbox, cigarette lighter, cigarette case, wristwatch, glasses case and so forth. Radio microphones and transmitters installed in a ballpoint pen (photo 1) and the handset of an ordinary telephone (photo 2) [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA publishes photos of the devices described] were described in the foreign magazine (ELEKTRONIKA). In the ballpoint pen, a subminiature, highly sensitive microphone is installed in the tip, while inside the pen is a radio transmitter with a power pack and an antenna in the form of a thin pin. The switch for the radiomicrophone is located in the lower part of the pen.

A radiomicrophone in a matchbox is created on the basis of a similar electrical circuit, but instead of a pin, a loop antenna is used around the perimeter of the matchbox.

These in brief, are some of the secret methods of electronic espionage used by foreign intelligence services. In conditions where imperialist circles in the United States and other NATO countries are implementing a policy of headlong arms race, trying to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union and doing everything to step up their subversive espionage activity, it is the duty of servicemen in our armed forces and all Soviet citizens to display high vigilance and expose and thwart the criminal activity of various imperialist states' special services.

PRC SCIENTISTS AT SYMPOSIUM IN DUSHANBE

OW290117 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to China 1430 GMT 28 Jun 82

[Text] In an interview with Beijing Radio reporters, (Wen Libian), deputy director of the Nationalities Institute of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, and (Chen Zhenfa), a scientist of the History (World) Institute, expressed thanks to the Soviet Academy of Sciences, Tadzhik SSR Academy of Science and Soviet Central Asia Culture Association, co-sponsors of the recent Dushanbe international symposium, for the warm reception they received while attending the symposium.

Prof (Wen Libian) said: We were greatly enlightened. The symposium has shown that scholars of different countries have accomplished much in the study of Central Asian history and culture.

(Chen Zhenfa) said: In the days when the symposium was held in Dushanbe, capital of the Tadzhik SSR, Chinese delegates made contacts with Soviet scholars, who treated the Chinese people and their scholars with sincerity and friendship.

MOSCOW TELEVISION ON BEIJING TRACK EVENT

LD261118 [Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 23 June carries in its Vremya newscast an item on sports including a brief report on a track and field event in Beijing, introduced by the announcer as follows: "Those fond of track and field events are probably aware that a large international competition with the participation of 11 countries has been held in the PRC."

This is followed by shots of the winners of the women's 100 meters hurdles event from the GDR and USSR on the rostrum receiving medals from and shaking hands with an unidentified PRC official.

Another shot shows the Soviet winner of the men's pole vault competing in that event, while the announcer reports that interest in the event has been high and that there are more than 50,000 spectators in the Beijing stadium.

The final shot is of the men's 110 meters hurdles won by a GDR athlete.

The newscast contains no remarks on Sino-Soviet sports contacts.

TIKHANOV CONGRATULES MALAYSIAN PRIME MINISTER

LD260700 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 25 Jun 82

[Text] Comrade Tikhonov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, has sent a telegram to Datuk Sri Mahathir bin Mohamed, prime minister of Malaysia, conveying the Soviet Government's and his own congratulations and best wishes on his reappointment to this post. In his answering telegrame the prime minister of Malaysia expressed his gratitude for the congratulations and good wishes. The telegrams express the hope that the friendly relations and mutually beneficial cooperation between the Soviet Union and Malaysia will continue to develop for the benefit of the peoples of both countries and in the interests of peace and international security.

KAMPUCHEAN ARMY PRAISED ON 31ST ANNIVERSARY

PM251439 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Jun 82 p 3

[Candidate of historical sciences Maj A. Nikulchenkov article: "Guardians of the Republic"]

[Text] The Kampuchean people's path to true freedom and independence was long and hard. More than once they had to rise up in struggle against foreign aggressors and their accomplices. In the course of this struggle 31 years ago the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Army was created, on 19 June 1951.

Under the blows from revolutionary forces, the colonialists were forced to leave the country in 1954. But the struggle went on, now against American imperialism and its puppets. It ended in April 1975 with the complete defeat of the Lon Nol regime and its patrons across the ocean.

However, the Kampuchean people were unable to enjoy the fruits of their victory. Power was seized by the pro-Beijing Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique, which dealt cruelly with true patriots and established a terrorist regime in the country. But it was unable to stifle the people's desire for freedom. The best representatives of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Army led the working people's struggle against the antipopular clique. In late 1978 a general uprising began in the country. The Beijing puppets' bloody regime was overthrown. On 7 January 1979 the People's Republic of Kampuchea was proclaimed. This victory put an end to the merciless extermination of the Khmers. True freedom and independence came to the land of Kampuchea.

The patriots' victory wrecked the Beijing hegemonists' far-reaching expansionist plans. The Chinese leaders are now trying to make up for the failures of their policy. To this end they are supplying weapons to the Pol Pot gangs entrenched on the Kampuchean-Thai border, which perpetrate provocations against Kampuchea. Acting in conjunction with the U.S. imperialists, Beijing is trying to knock together a so-called "united front" of Khmer reactionaries of all hues. The Khmer people resolutely reject interference in their affairs. The Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Army rebuffs provocateurs in a fitting manner.

The Kampuchean party and government are doing everything necessary to strengthen the country's defense capability and further develop and improve its armed forces. At present these consist of regular and territorial troops as well as civil self-defense forces. The Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Army vigilantly protects the motherland's borders and is increasing its vigilance. In addition to fulfilling combat tasks, its fighters and commanders fulfilling combat tasks, give assistance to the population in restoring the national economy and carrying out agricultural operations. The Kampuchean people are rightly proud of their servicemen, who, with their labor, are making a great contribution to the republic's rebirth and the building of a new life.

The Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Army is linked by close ties of friendship and combat solidarity with the armies of the Soviet Union, Vietnam and the other fraternal socialist countries. This friendship is developing and strengthening. On the 31st anniversary of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Army, Soviet servicemen wish it new successes in strengthening its country's defense capability and defending the revolution's gains against encroachments by foreign and internal reaction.

MATERIAL ON 12TH LCY CONGRESS IN YUGOSLAVIA

USSR Delegation Leaves Moscow

LD251700 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 25 Jun 82

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] A CPSU delegation led by Vasiliy Kuznetsov, alternate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first vice president of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, left Moscow for Belgrade today to attend the 12th Congress of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia [LCY] at the invitation of the LCY Central Committee. Comrade Rakhmanin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and Soviet Ambassador to Yugoslavia Comrade Rodionov are also in the delegation.

The delegation was seen off at the airport by Comrade Ponomarev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee, and other officials

Congress Opens

LD260934 Moscow TASS in English 0929 GMT 26 Jun 82

[Text] Belgrade June 26 TASS -- The 12th Congress of the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia opened in Belgrade's Sava Palace of Congresses today. It is being attended by over 1,500 delegates representing almost 2.2 million Communists. They will draw the balance sheet for the work done by the party and the country and map out tasks for the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia's further economic, social and political development.

CPSU CC Greetings

PM281350 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 82 p 1

["To the 12th LCY Congress" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] Esteemed comrades!

The CPSU Central Committee sends greetings and wishes for successful work to the delegates to the 12th LCY Congress and, through them, to all the SFRY's Communists and working people.

It is with sincere good will Soviet people follow the deeds and concerns of the peoples of Yugoslavia and their active efforts to stabilize the country's economy and to ensure the socialist development of their multinational state.

International practice is evidence of the diversity of forms and methods of building socialism, which are prompted by the specific national and historical conditions. It demonstrates the commonality of the fundamental principles of the socialist system. Socialism, its class nature creates objective conditions for strengthening and developing friendship and all-round cooperation between the socialist countries, the communist and workers' parties. The constant deepening and broadening of mutual ties is helping them to successfully solve the tasks involved in building a new society, consistently guided by internationalist Marxist-Leninist teaching -- the inexhaustible source of the masses' revolutionary energy and creativity.

The active cooperation of the socialist states is especially essential in the current international situation where the arms race is being intensified, conflicts are being aggravated and new military hotbeds are emerging through the fault of the forces of imperialism and their accomplices and where imperialists are using economic relations as a tool of diktat and blackmail. There is now no task more important for the countries of socialism, the non-aligned states and all peace-loving forces than that of removing the threat of nuclear war and ensuring the confident march of the process of detente.

The CPSU and the Soviet people, in resolutely rebuffing the imperialist policy of military adventures and provocations are consistently observing the Leninist line of peace and friendship among the peoples.

Noting the positive results in the development of Soviet-Yugoslav relations in many fields the CPSU Central Committee confirms its constant readiness to continue consolidating all-round cooperation between the CPSU and the LCY, the USSR and the SFRY on the basis of equality and mutual respect and with strict observance of the principles, provisions and accords laid down in joint bilateral documents.

May friendship and cooperation between Soviet and Yugoslav Communists and the peoples of our countries grow stronger! Long live peace and socialism!

Dragosavac Address

LD261340 Moscow TASS in English 1316 GMT 26 Jun 82

[Text] Belgrade June 26 TASS -- Dusan Dragosavac, chairman of the Presidium of the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia (SKJ), addressed the 12th SKJ Congress which opened here today. He noted that Socialist Yugoslavia has effected major qualitative changes in the development of its productive forces. The further socio-economic advancement is connected with the need to remove the causes of the difficulties that have arisen. This will require the organised activity of all public forces.

Speaking about the development of Yugoslavia's economy, Dusan Dragosavac pointed out the growth of the socialised product and increased industrial production. At the same time, the rate of agricultural growth is yet very low.

Appreciable headway has been made in the post-war period in the sphere of social policy. But the pace of the improvement of the living standard in the past two years slowed down considerably; the problem of unemployment remains acute.

Yugoslavia has large internal reserves and latent opportunities, the speaker said. One of the essential components of stable growth is the comprehensive integration of the Yugoslav economy in the international division of labour. Social planning on the self-management footing should be launched and vigorously developed.

The ideological trends alien to self-management and socialism, especially nationalism, Dusan Dragosavac said, have spread more visibly in recent time. They have made their way also into the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia, infecting some leaders like it was in Kosovo.

The ability to play the leading part in organised ideological struggle is of considerable significance to the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia. "We are unanimous that relations in the SKJ and its ideological-political unity should in the future develop on the principles of democratic centralism," the chairman of the Presidium of the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia emphasised.

Speaking about the international situation, he declared that it has dramatically deteriorated in recent years. The arms race is being stepped up and new seats of international crises are coming to exist.

At the same time the speaker contended that "the reasons behind the negative development of international relations are, first of all, in the striving of the great powers and blocs to extend the spheres of their influence and domination."

The struggle for peace is assuming the scale of a mass movement across the world, he said. We support every realistic initiative that could lead to an end or a restriction of the arms race and the commencement of the process of disarmament. We favour an integral and just solution to the Middle East crisis, with the Palestinian issue lying at its heart. We strongly condemn the Israeli aggression against Lebanon.

The SKJ is developing diversified and fruitful cooperation with communist, socialist and social democratic parties, liberation and other progressive movements. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the Union of Communists of Yugoslavia are paying much attention to cooperation and relations with socialist countries.

PRAVDA Account

PM281317 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 82 p 4

[TASS report: "D. Dragosavac's Speech"]

[Text] Belgrade, 21 Jun -- TANJUG reports that D. Dragosavac, president of the LCY Central Committee Presidium, addressing the Yugoslav War Veterans Organization Congress, stressed the determination of the working class and all the country's working people to continue to march along the path of socialism. Special responsibility for the consolidation of the revolutionary gains of the SFRY people, he noted, rests with the LCY -- the leading force of society. The forthcoming 12th LCY Congress is to outline paths for the country's further all-around development in the interests of the working class, peasantry and all Yugoslav peoples.

The period under review, the speech continues, has been a hard one. The economic situation has become exacerbated, and a number of domestic political problems have arisen, particularly in the Autonomous Province of Kosovo where there have been nationalist disturbances.

Antisocialist elements are trying to use our shortcomings in ideological work to undermine the foundations of the SFRY state system, the speaker noted. Under cover of the phony slogan of "freedom" they are preaching nationalism, sowing religious hostility to the benefit of the reactionary forces who are kindling wars and pursuing a policy of international terrorism, thereby violating basic human rights.

We must be vigilant with respect to the intrigues of hostile forces. It should be clear to everyone that freedom and democracy in Yugoslavia exist for the working people and not for the traitors, chauvinists and other subversive elements. It is essential to treat errors and shortcomings critically and to surmount them by joint efforts. That is one of the main tasks of building socialism.

Kuznetsov Meets Stambolic

LD272134 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Jun 82

[Text] The CPSU delegation at the 12th LCY Congress led by Comrade Kuznetsov, today had a meeting with Stambolic, chairman of the SFRY Presidium. During the conversation, which was held in a friendly atmosphere, opinions were exchanged on questions of mutual interest.

Kuznetsov, Culafic Meet

LD270634 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 27 Jun 82

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee Politburo sent greetings to the 12th LCY Congress stressing the importance of active cooperation between the socialist countries. Today the congress continues its work. Yesterday Dragosavac, LCY Central Committee Presidium president, gave a report at the congress.

On 26 June the CPSU delegation at the 12th LCY Congress, headed by Kuznetsov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo Candidate member and USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium deputy chairman, met Culafic, LCY Central Committee Presidium secretary. During the talk, which took place in a friendly atmosphere, information was exchanged on CPSU and LCY activities at the present stage. Questions of Soviet-Yugoslav cooperation and topical international problems were discussed.

Kuznetsov Shipyard Speech

LD282310 Moscow in Serbo-Croatian to Yugoslavia 1600 GMT 28 Jun 82

[Speech by Vasiliy Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidieum, to a 28 June meeting with the party-economic aktiv at the 3 May Shipyard in Rijeka, Yugoslavia -- read by announcer]

[Text] On behalf of the CPSU delegation, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude for the invitation to visit your enterprise and acquaint ourselves with the work of your collective.

Allow me to convey to you, and through you to all the Communists and working people of Yugoslavia, fraternal warm greetings from the 17 million Communists of our country and all the working people of the Soviet Union.

Dear friends, Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, asked me to convey to you his sincere wishes for success in your work and for good health and happiness.

We are particularly happy to be visiting the workers of Rijeka today because your enterprise maintains good business links with our country. The ships which are built in your shipyards are distinguished by great reliability and enjoy a good reputation among Soviet seamen. The delivery by Yugoslav shipbuilders of ships ordered by the Soviet Union is an important sector of our two countries' mutually beneficial links which are based on equality. Other fruits of our friendly cooperation are major power stations, ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy enterprises and coal mines built or under construction in Yugoslavia with the participation of the Soviet Union. There are now more than 100 projects of this kind.

On the other hand, the skill of the Yugoslav builders at work in our country is held in high esteem in the Soviet Union.

We are glad that Soviet-Yugoslav economic links keep expanding from year to year. The Soviet Union is today the most important trade partner of Yugoslavia. Our contacts and links do not comprise the economy alone, but also culture, education, science -- in other words, various aspects of the two countries' life.

The policy of the further development of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the SFRY and the CPSU and the LCY was reaffirmed in the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress. There is no doubt that this policy is in keeping with the vital interests of the peoples of our two countries.

The importance which Josip Broz Tito, outstanding leader of the peoples of Yugoslavia and prominent worker of the international communist and workers movement, attached to the strengthening of Soviet-Yugoslav friendship is well known.

The constant readiness to continue to expand and strengthen relations between our parties and countries was reaffirmed in the greetings sent by the CPSU Central Committee to the 12th LCY Congress. A very reliable basis for this is provided by the principles and accords enshrined in the joint documents which were adopted during the meetings and talks between Leonid Ilich Brezhnev and Josip Broz Tito and other Yugoslav leaders. The essence of these accords lies in the genuine desire for mutual understanding and trust, respect for the experience of the other side and strict respect for the principles of independence, equality and noninterference in internal affairs in keeping with the internationalist approach and careful consideration of the vital interests of both countries.

Communists and working people of the Soviet Union are interested sincerely and in a friendly way in the Yugoslav peoples' life and the activity of the LCY. The historical destiny of the peoples of your country has not been easy. For centuries they had to struggle against alien invaders.

The Soviet people, who bore the main brunt of World War II, hold in high esteem the heroic contribution made by the Yugoslav people to the common victory over fascism. We wish the Yugoslav class brothers further successes in the building of socialism, the road to which was cleared in the fire of the revolutionary liberation struggle.

Historical experience shows that the development of mutual relations between socialist countries is in keeping with their joint interests and that at the same time it strengthens the international positions of the forces which strive for social progress. It is not an accident that imperialism and world reaction should persistently be trying, especially during the recent period, to disunite and estrange socialist countries and turn them against one another. To this end our common foes launch the fabrication that the Soviet Union is allegedly imposing on others its own road of building socialism and its own form of social and state system, but this is an obvious lie. In fact, by completely distorting Soviet experience and the internal and foreign policies of the Soviet state the enemies of socialism would like to discredit the very idea of the socialist system and the role played by the communist parties in administering society and to undermine the international solidarity of the socialist countries.

As was noted at the 26th CPSU Congress, our party considers the diversity of forms in the social life and organization of the economy of the socialist countries to reflect the multitude of ways and methods of establishing the socialist way of life. Vladimir Ilich Lenin stressed the importance of that kind of application of the fundamental principles of communism which correctly modified individual aspects of these principles and correctly adapted them to and applied them in keeping with national and national state differences. For its part, the Soviet Union does not impose any stereotypes and any models of any state system. We are against any mutual confrontation of the theory and practice of socialism in various countries. Every fraternal party, every state makes its own contribution to the collective treasurey of experience on the building of a new society.

This year we mark the 60th anniversary of the voluntary unification of the peoples of our country into the USSR. During a historically brief period international cooperation and mutual assistance have become a powerful factor of progress of the whole of Soviet society and of the development of every single Soviet republic and all the nations and nationalities of which there are over 100 in the Soviet Union. Their united efforts have created the unified economic complex, the powerful material foundation of the peoples of the USSR. The problem of equalizing the level of the Soviet republics' economic development has on the whole been solved. Backwardness of the so-called peripheral peoples has become a matter of the past. Now every republic is characterized by modern, highly mechanized production, advanced science, cultural growth and implementation of extensive social programs.

The political basis for social achievements in all our republics is provided by Soviet rule, unity of the working class, peasantry, intelligentsia, all the nations and nationalities gathered round the Communist Party and by the development of our socialist democracy. The elections for the local soviets of people's deputies were held a few days ago. The most mass-based organs of our people's rule and virtually the cornerstone of this rule have been renewed. More than two-thirds of the newly-elected deputies -- and there are over 2 million of them -- are workers and collective farmers directly involved in the production of material values. More than 50 percent of the deputies are non-party people and more than 25 percent are young men and women, while 50 percent of the deputies are women.

In our country the historical mission of the working class is realized through the work collectives who actively solve state and social tasks and take part in the planning of production and social development, in the preparation and distribution of cadres, in the spending of funds earmarked for the development of social production and for social and cultural measures and material incentives.

The congresses of the trade unions and the Leninist Komsomol which were held this year were of great importance for further progress along the road of socialist democracy. A variety of problems were dealt with at these congresses, but what they undoubtedly had in common was the constant intensification of activity by social organizations (?and) the broader participation of the working people in the life of the country.

Our party views things realistically, does not simplify reality and does not embellish it. We are better aware than our critics of our difficulties and our unsolved problems. The party is aware of them, mobilizes the working people for the effort needed to overcome them successfully, proposes solutions which are carefully prepared, taking into account the views and proposals from the work collectives.

The plenary session of the CPSU Central Committee which was held in May adopted important measures for the further development of agriculture. These measures had been prepared with the active participation of farm workers, scientists, agricultural experts, and representatives of the union republics, krays and oblasts of our country. The Food Program for the period up to 1990 -- the most important part of the party's economic strategy -- is to ensure the progress of the entire national economy of the country and, on that basis, of the further rise of the standard of living of the Soviet people.

In brief, comrades, the Soviet people are dedicated to creative work, for the success of which we need a clear sky overhead and the certainty that no one will dare to threaten our borders and security of our friends and allies. However, in recent years the situation in the world has deteriorated considerably. The main cause of such a situation is obvious -- the attempts of the most aggressive circles of imperialism, primarily the ruling circles of the United States, to stop social progress and establish their hegemony in the world. This is accompanied by the incessant repetition of false assertions that the Soviet Union allegedly is threatening somebody with something. The aim of these maneuvers is clear: to deceive the world public and, by casting a shadow on the policy of the socialist states, clear those who are really responsible for international tension.

So let us examine the facts. What country is adopting a 5-year armament program to the tune of several billion dollars, is relying on making the first nuclear strike and is discussing the possibility of some limited, allegedly not very dangerous nuclear war somewhere in Europe, a long way from its borders? The leadership of what state has recently in effect proclaimed a new crusade against socialist countries, is trying to turn peaceful international cooperation into an instrument of pressure and blackmail and is supporting the banditry of the Israeli aggressors and South African racists? And what military bloc is increasing not only the quantity of its arms, but also the number of its members and its trying to extend the zone of its activity to the whole world by declaring that the Middle and Far East, Africa and Latin America are in the sphere of its vital interests?

I think that it is clear to every objective observer who is responsible for the exacerbation of international relations and deterioration of the political climate on our planet.

The policy of the Soviet Union has a fundamentally different character which stems from the very essence of our socialist system. By adopting the most necessary measures aimed at ensuring its security, the land of the Soviets at the same time makes use and will continue to make use of all of its potential in the interests of consolidating international security and strengthening of peace among nations. The Soviet Union does not plan war but peace. It does not lay stress on the concept of military superiority, but on the idea of equality and equal security. It does not proclaim any doctrine of nuclear conflict, but proposes steps which lead to the freezing and reduction of the nuclear arsenals. Soberly appraising the international situation we consider that it can change for the better, that the danger of war can be averted. This is the aim of the clear and concrete measures outlined in the Peace Program for the Eighties adopted at the 26th CPSU Congress and also in a whole series of speeches made after the congress by Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

A new convincing proof of the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union is its pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. This was stated in Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's message to the second special session on disarmament at the UN General Assembly. The peoples of the world are entitled to expect that this decision by the Soviet Union will be followed by the reciprocal steps of other nuclear states.

The Soviet initiatives are aimed at strengthening peace and the security of all the regions of the world. It is understandable that a special place among them should belong to Europe, our common home, where relaxation has grown its deepest roots and where, at the same time, vast quantities of mass extermination means are concentrated. The Soviet Union is in favor of negotiations on Europe's problems which would exclude the possibility of our continent being turned into a nuclear firing range and it is also in favor of the complete elimination of nuclear arms in Europe and also the reduction of conventional armed forces. Let Europe and the Mediterranean basin, where your beautiful town lies, become a zone of stable peace and goodneighborliness.

As Leonid Brezhnev stressed, the Soviet Union is wholly in favor of progress in every direction where there is a possibility for limitation and positive reduction of arms, be they nuclear arms, other kinds of mass extermination arms or conventional arms. There is no kind of arms which the Soviet Union would not be prepared to limit or ban on a reciprocal basis.

In the struggle for the elimination of war from the life of mankind an important role belongs to the Nonaligned Movement. The Soviet Union views with respect its active work aimed at promoting cooperation on the basis of equality between all states and nations and also at opposing the imperialist diktat and all the forms of colonialism and neo-colonialism. We sincerely wish the member countries of the Nonaligned Movement success on this road.

Dear comrades, allow me in conclusion to assure you once more that the Soviet people with all their heart wish Yugoslavia and its peoples, headed by the League of Communists, prosperity, well-being and fresh successes on the road of the building of socialism; the consolidation of fraternal friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, the further consolidation and development of cooperation between the CPSU and the LCY and for peace in the whole world.

CHURCH'S ROLE IN 13 JUN POLISH RIOTS ATTACKED

PM281427 Moscow LITERNATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 23 Jun 82 p 9

[Special correspondent Viktor Tsoppi dispatch under rubric "Plot Against Poland": "Church Service or Briefing?"]

[Text] Warsaw -- People's Poland is living a tense life. It is now clear to all sober-minded Poles that the introduction of martial law last December was urgently needed and absolutely necessary. This move truly saved the country from chaos, anarchy and maybe a fratricidal conflict. It kept Poland on the very brink of the abyss into which the Solidarity extremist leadership, its advisers in the counterrevolutionary KSS-KOR and KPM [Confederation for an Independent Poland] organizations and their masters in the West had intended to push the country. "A tranquillity making it possible to live and work normally has returned at last to the country," worker Andrzej Machnacki, an electrician from Katowice, wrote in TRYBUNA LUDU. To live normally means ceasing to rush around in an atmosphere of social psychosis. And to work normally?

I have been visiting several enterprises and I can testify that really normal work is underway and the production plans are being fulfilled. But I am far from thinking of idealizing the processes underway in Poland. Not everything is smooth, splendid and serene there.

Another attempt to prevent the continued normalization of life in the country was made Sunday 13 June, which was 6 months to the day after the introduction of martial law. Western subversive centers and their agents inside the country prepared the scenario for the provocation in good time.

Leaflets calling for a "protest demonstration" on 13 June appeared at the beginning of the month. There were not all that many of them. But their text was repeatedly broadcast by voice of America, Radio-France Internationale and Radio Free Europe, and, having been circulated in this way, became widely known. The onslaught by counterrevolution was intended to be all-Polish. But it disturbed people's Sunday rest only in Gdansk, Wroclaw and Nowa Huta.

In Nowa Huta -- a city of metallurgists working in the famous combine named for Lenin which was constructed with the Soviet Union's aid -- which I visited the day after the events; I was told a few details. Most of the participants in the anti-socialist hooligan actions were youths from secondary schools in Krakow, of which Nowa Huta is an industrial suburb. They had bawled carefully memorized slogans of the counterrevolutionary underground, pried cobblestones out of the roadway, hurled them through windows and attacked the militiamen, who resorted to force only at the very last moment in order to pacify the rampaging, deluded mob. The leaders of the PZPR organization at the combine drew attention to the two circumstances. First, with very rare exceptions, the workers boycotted this well-organized "sponteneous" demonstration. Yet it cannot be forgotten that it is not all that long since Solidarity was virtually an all-powerful master in the combine. And second, the outrages began immediately after a service in a church were a meeting of the provocateurs had been set in advance. For all its vague and supernatural phraseology, the actual service they attended was a sermon against the people's power in general and against martial law in particular.

Events in Wroclaw and Gdansk developed according to the same scheme. The thugs arrested by the Wroclaw militia included a student from the theological college there. In Gdansk the disturbances began immediately after believers neither in God nor in the devil left the Mariacki Church and Saint Brigid's Church. In this connection DZIENNIK BALTYCKI stated: "Churches have become places for assemblages and briefings and refuges for those who are opposed to order. The Church is being drawn into the ambit of vigorous political activity."

The new tendencies in the behavior of church representatives worry many people here. People are asking themselves: Aren't certain church dioceses tempted to take over from the compromised Solidarity, defeated 6 months ago, and to replace it in the sphere of influence on public opinion in order to consolidate their own positions and to act no longer as a moral mentor but as a political organization in opposition to the socialist system? Reflections about that are all the more topical in that there is now much talk in Poland about whether or not the visit of Pope John Paul II, scheduled for late August, is going to take place. A few days ago PAP set out the official viewpoint on this score. This boils down to saying that the visit will be possible only if complete tranquility sets in everywhere in the country and if all the necessary security conditions are created. But this is exactly what those forces inside and outside Poland which, by godlessly speculating in the name of God, would like to cause fresh social tension and galvanize the counterrevolution do not want.

GDR WEEKLY CITED ON ANTI-POLISH SUBVERSION

PM281309 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 June 82 p 3

[TASS report: "CIA Operation"]

[Text] Berlin, 15 Jun -- As far back as the mid-seventies the U.S. CIA launched the accelerated preparation and implementation of long-term operations against Poland with the aim of "undermining socialism from within" in an attempt to prevent Poland's development as a socialist country and as a firm link of the socialist community, the weekly HORIZONT (GDR) writes in an article entitled "CIA Subversive Operations Against Poland."

On the imperialist secret services' direct instructions, the article notes, counter-revolutionary groups have been formed in Poland with the task, according to CIA instructions, of fabricating antisocialist libels and putting forward provocative demands. The CIA has effectively guided the actions of socialism's enemies in Poland, furnishing them with subversive propaganda materials and money. The FRG's Federal Intelligence Service has also participated in similar operations against Poland. The special services have used Poland's economic relations with Western countries, the weekly stresses, to exert political pressure on Poland.

During the seventies, the article continues, anti-Polish emigre organizations were activized in the United States with the CIA's direct support and participation. They used new methods of subversive work primarily to exert political influence on Poland's development. These emigre organizations include the "Polish-American Congress," the "Polish Institute of Sciences," the terrorist organization "Free Poland," created in New York in 1975, "Confederation-76" and others.

The article examines in detail the role in the subversive activity against Poland and other socialist states played by the anticommunist CIA radio stations "Radio Liberty" and "Radio Free Europe", where former Nazis are entrenched.

The interference being committed at present by the U.S. administration in a sovereign state's internal affairs is nothing other than a direct continuation of the subversive schemes of the United States and its secret services in the interests of U.S. policy, which is directed against detente, and of international tension, HORIZONT stresses.

REPORT ON GDR-USSR COMMISSION SESSION IN MOSCOW

AU241338 East Berlin NEUES DEUTSCHLAND in German 19/20 Jun 82 p 6

[ADN report -- "Press Statement on the 30th Session of the GDR-USSR Bilateral Government Commission: Important Steps To Strengthen the Capability of Both Fraternal Countries"]

[Text] Moscow (ADN) -- The 30th session of the bilateral government Commission for Economic and Scientific-Technical Cooperation between the GDR and the USSR took place in Moscow from 16 to 18 June 1982. The delegations were headed by Gerhard Schuerer, candidate member of the SED Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, and by Leonid Kostandov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

On 17 June 1982 N.A. Tikhonov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received Gerhard Schuerer for talks.

Central to the 30th session of the government commission were measures and steps aimed at the implementation of the agreements concluded between Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, and Leonid Ilich Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, for deepening cooperation in science, technology and in production, and for the further interlacing of the national economies of the GDR and the USSR.

Consistently realizing the program for specializing and coordinating production between the GDR and the USSR until 1990, important stipulations were decided and agreements were made aimed at even more effectively using the joint scientific-technical and economic potential of the GDR and USSR for the mutual benefit of, and at further strengthening, the economic power of the two countries.

Sixteen agreements were concluded at the session. The accord between the governments of the GDR and the USSR on establishing a railway-ferry connection envisages creating joint prerequisites to ensure the opening of a ferry service between the port of Sassnitz/Mukran on the island of Ruegen and the port of Klaipeda in the Lithuanian SSR in 1986.

This new integration project takes into account the requirements of coping with the constantly growing foreign trade transports with the USSR, and maritime goods transports will be continued on a qualitatively higher level. The direct combination of rail and sea transport and the new technical-technological solutions of loading and unloading the ferries will help to effectively fashion commodity exchange as well as transport relations between the GDR and the USSR.

Proceeding from the targets adopted at the 10th SED Congress and at the 26th CPSU Congress for introducing robot technology, the commission discussed the implementation of the government agreement concluded in December 1981 in the field of robot technology and adopted measures aimed at a quick application of the results in major branches. Additional industrial sectors and research institutions including the academies of sciences and higher education ministries of the two countries, will be enlisted in work in this field.

A key point at the 30th session of the bilateral government commission was the dealing with tasks and measures for expanding and deepening cooperation in the field of fuel and power economy. It was agreed to more conprehensively exploit solid fuel reserves and to refine them up to higher grades, to expand cooperation within the framework of the existing government agreement, and to develop new, modern techniques and equipment for the gasification and chemical processing of coal. It is being envisaged to jointly speed up the industrial production of basic materials and intermediate products for the chemical industry from brown coal.

In addition, the commission dealt with measures and proposals for expanding research and production cooperation with respect to equipment and plant for long-distance pipelines as well as to the use of alternative fuels, including the manufacture of the equipment required for that purpose. An agreement was concluded about organizing the production and delivery of appropriate compressors.

The discussion of comprehensive tasks and accords on cooperation in the field of consumer goods production played a considerable role at the session.

The commission noted that comprehensive work was performed on establishing new relations for technical-economic support, on intensifying the exchange of experiences and scientific-technical collaboration as well as on developing specialization and cooperation between the corresponding sectors of the two countries. Conferences of specialists related to almost 100 complexes took place in combines, production associations and enterprises of both countries.

On this basis the commission discussed concrete proposals and accords for the rationalization and reconstruction of enterprises and enterprise sectors, for enhancing the quality of products and for expanding their variety with modern essential commodities. These measures are aimed at further improving supplies to the population in keeping with the growing material needs.

In order to implement the joint projects in modernizing and rationalizing the Soviet light and food industry, the GDR will, among other things, also participate by supplying specific equipment and rationalization means.

A government agreement on modernizing and intensifying production in Soviet readymade clothes enterprises was concluded, which envisaged the drafting of joint technical, technological, and labor organizational rationalization solutions. It is aimed at enhancing the production and the quality of the products.

The cooperation between GDR combines and enterprises and local industry in the RSFSR, the Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Belorussian, Armenian and Azerbaijan SSR's in the field of the manufacture of musical instruments, toys and children's vehicles and lighting fixtures will be organized through the conclusion of ministers' agreements. The exchange and broad application of progressive experiences, technologies and rationalization solutions, the joint development of products and equipment, the exchange of rationalization means as well as the mutual supply of specific materials and components serves the purpose of intensifying production in the local economy enterprises. These multifaceted projects make it possible to boost the output of modern consumer goods on a qualitative basis.

The commission dealt with additional agreements on deepening research and production cooperation as well with intensifying the production in the chemical industry, heavy machine-building, and in processing machinery building, as well as in the glass and ceramics industry.

The agreements in the field of fertilizer production concern, among other things, the intensification of existing plant complexes for ammonia and urea, the direct cooperation in the planned maintenance of plants as well as the development of effective new substances.

In cooperation between the manufacturers and users of plastic materials in the two countries, measures for a more effective utilization of plastics through the use of fillers and reinforcements will be initiated, in keeping with an agreement. The joint work of the researchers, developers and workers, as well as the utilization of the lead which exists in that area in the two countries, enable the solution of this national economically important target in a shorter time and with less expenditure.

The rationalization and intensification of technological processes in chemical plant construction in the GDR and the USSR, which was also agreed upon comprises, among other things, the creation of comprehensively mechanized conveyor belts in chemical appliance building.

On the basis of the positive results achieved in developing procedures and equipment for the manufacture of polyester fibers which have already been transferred into practice in the two countries, an agreement envisages continuing the cooperation and further development of the jointly created procedures and equipment as well as a reconstruction of existing plans for the manufacture of new products.

The commission discusses a number of agreements and issued orders for new cooperation projects in machine-building proceeding from the main trends of specialization and cooperation of the output of the machine-building branches.

In keeping with an accord, the GDR railway car building industry will develop and produce a new generation of long distance passenger coaches in cooperation with its partners in the USSR. Thus a main export line of GDR machine-building which has stably developed over a long period, will be continued on a qualitatively higher level.

The USSR supplies a number of machine tools as well as components and complementary parts for the new equipment of the railway car building enterprises and for the serial production of the new cars.

In the field of foundry technology the GDR Ministry of Heavy Machinery Construction and Installation Construction, and the USSR Ministry of Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry agreed on tasks to enhance the technical level and to create new products. These ensure to their users greater productivity and effectiveness through a higher degree of automation as well as a substantial improvement of the working and living conditions.

The GDR Ministry of the Glass and Ceramics Industry and the USSR Ministry of Construction Materials Industry agreed to jointly intensify the production of plate glass and technical glass products as a result of technological comparisons between enterprises of the two countries and to rationalize it.

The concerted measures make it possible to reduce research expenditures in the two countries, to boost output while concurrently cutting the expenditures on materials and energy by adopting progressive technical and technological solutions and to eliminate heavy physical labor.

In keeping with the commission's work, plan deliberations took place in production associations, enterprises and institutes about the state of implementation of earlier concluded agreements. Gerhard Schuerer, the chairman of the GDR part of the commission, studied the results of the cooperation between the GDR and the USSR in developing equipment for the metallurgical refinement industry at an enterprise of the metallurgical machine building industry in the Moscow area. Other commission members and experts of both sides deliberated on deepening cooperation, among other things, in the field of chemical fibre production, the manufacture and processing of plastic materials, machine tool building, the manufacture of electric motors as well as the manufacture of technological equipment for electrical engineering and electronics.

Participating in the deliberations of the 30th session of the bilateral government commission were:

On the GDR side: Herbert Weiz, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, minister of science and technology and deputy chairman of the GDR part of the commission; Karl Gruenheid, state secretary in the State Planning Commission, deputy chairman of the GDR part of the commission; Egon Winkelmann, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the GDR to the USSR; Otto Arndt, minister of transport; Werner Buschmann, minister of light industry; Rudi Georgi, minister of machine tool and processing machinery building; Rolf Kersten, minister of heavy machine construction and installation construction; Horst Soelle, foreign trade minister; Otfried Steger, minister of electrical engineering and electronics; Guenther Wyschofsky, minister of chemical industry; Horst Tschanter, head of the CEMA work group of the SED Central Committee; Rudi Heinze, deputy chairman of the State Planning Commission; Heinz Mueller, state secretary of the Ministry of the Glass and Ceramics Industry; Jochen Niemann, state secretary of the Ministry of Bezirk-Administered Industry and Food Industry; Klaus Stubenrauch, state secretary of the Ministry of Science and Technology; Karl-Heinz Richter, head of the USSR section of the State Planning Commission, responsible secretary of the GDR part of the Commission; Gunther Fritzsching, head of the permanent representation of the GDR part of the bilateral commission.

On the USSR side: P.A. Abrasimov, USSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the GDR; Y.P. Ryabov, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Commission, deputy chairman of the USSR part of the commission; K. M. Dyumayev, deputy chairman of the Soviet part of the commission; T.B. Guzhenko, minister of the Maritime Fleet; V.V. Krotov, minister of power machine building; I.G. Pavlovskiy, minister of railways; N.N. Tarasov, minister of light industry; N.D. Komarov, first deputy foreign trade minister; V.V. Listov, minister of chemical industry; A.G. Petrishchev minister of mineral fertilizer production; A.I. Jashin, minister of construction materials industry; A.K. Melnichenko, minister of the medical industry; I.I. Pudkov, minister of machine building for light and food industry and household appliances; V. Ye. Biryukov, deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee; G.P. Voronskiy, first deputy minister of electrical equipment industry; A.G. Rutskoy, first deputy minister of chemical and petroleum machine building; A.P. Vasilev, deputy minister of machine tool and tool building industry; Y.S. Medvedkov, responsible secretary of the Soviet part of the commission; N.A. Baturin, head of the permanent representation of the Soviet part of the commission in Berlin.

Other deputy ministers and experts of both sides participated in the deliberation.

RCP DELEGATION RECEIVED BY KAPITONOV

PM251437 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 82 p 5

[TASS report: "Exchange of Experience"]

[Text] A delegation of RCP party workers headed by I. Moga, member of the RCP Central Committee and first deputy chief of the RCP Central Committee Party Organization Section, was in the Soviet Union 10 through 17 June in accordance with the plan for interparty ties between the CPSU and the RCP.

The Romanian comrades familiarized themselves with the CPSU's experience in organizing the control and verification of the execution of the party and state organs' decisions in the light of the 26th CPSU Congress instructions. They had meetings and talks at the CPSU Central Committee party organizational work section, the Belorussian CP Central Committee, the Moskovskiy Party Obkom and the Minsk Party Gorkom and at the party committees of a number of enterprises and organizations.

The delegation was received by I.V. Kapitonov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who had a friendly talk with it in which P.A. Smolskiy, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee party organizational work section, and T. Dudas, Romanian ambassador to the USSR, took part.

HUNGARY'S LOSONCZI SENDS MESSAGE TO BREZHNEV

PM281009 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 82 p 2

[TASS report: "From on Board Aircraft"]

[Text] P. Losonczi, president of the Hungarian Presidential Council, has sent a telegram from on board his aircraft to L.I. Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, reading:

"On leaving the Soviet Union's air space, we send you and the fraternal Soviet people warm greetings and good wishes.

"I express sincere thanks for the cordial reception and hospitality rendered to me during my stay in Tashkent."

PRAVDA NOTES MARCHUK MEETINGS WITH KADAR, LAZAR

PM251433 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 82 p 5

[Text] Budapest, 17 Jun -- J. Kadar, first secretary of the MSZMP Central Committee, has received G.I. Marchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, who has been here on a visit. He was also received by G. Lazar, chairman of the Hungarian Council of Ministers. During the talks there was a discussion of questions of expanding scientific and technical cooperation between the two countries.

DEMICHEV'S ARRIVAL IN BUDAPEST REPORTED

LD281342 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 28 Jun 82

[Text] Comrade Demichev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of culture, arrived in Budapest from Moscow today in order to take part in the 18th session of the Soviet-Hungarian intergovernmental Commission on Cultural Cooperation.

CONTINUING COVERAGE OF JOINT SPACE MISSION

Experiments Begin

LD281140 Moscow TASS in English 1016 GMT 28 Jun 82

[Text] Mission Control Centre June 28 TASS — The international crew consisting of Anatoliy Berezovoy, Valentin Lebedev, Vladimir Dzhanibekov, Aleksandr Ivanchenkov and Jean-Loup Chretien, which is working for the third day on board the orbital complex Salyut-7-Soyuz T-5-Soyuz T-6, has started the experiments "Piramig" and "PCN". Their aim is to study the atmosphere of the earth, the interplanetary medium, galaxial [as received] and extragalaxial sources of emission. The astrophysical studies conducted from board the orbital station make it possible to obtain more trustworthy information about the objects under study. These joint experiments are being conducted with the use of photo equipment designed by French specialists.

The crew of the visiting expedition has performed yet another cycle of studies to evaluate the state of the cardio-vascular system and eyesight at the stage of adaption to conditions of cosmic flight.

A program of space material studies provides for an experiment involving Soviet installation Kristall, which will help determine the diffusion coefficients of materials in weightlessness, with the use of copper and lead. The ampoules with the strating [as received] substances were prepared by French scientists.

Later in the day the international crew will give a press conference for Soviet and foreign correspondents covering the flight. The press conference will last for two television sessions in the evening.

According to reports from the orbiting complex and telemetric data, the flight of the research complex Salyut-7-Soyuz T-5-Soyuz T-6 is proceeding normally. The cosmonauts are feeling well.

Cosmonauts' Press Conference

LD281900 Moscow TASS in English 1840 GMT 28 Jun 82

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS -- Scientific experiments, prepared by Soviet and French scientists, are in full swing onboard the Salyut-7 orbiting station, but flight officials have found time and invited journalists to meet the spacemen on the air. Newsmen from leading French papers and magazines, FRANCE PRESSE correspondents and Soviet journalists gathered at the main hall of the mission control centre.

The five members of the united space crew appeared on the television screen. The station's walls are decorated with the flags of the USSR and France. "Pamir-3, please move closer," an operator asked the French cosmonaut, and Jean-Loup Chretien, easily pushing off from his chair and floating closer to the camera, settled down near Elbrus-2, Valentin Lebedev.

"Our planet is very beautiful. On earth one cannot even imagine what a wonderful sight it is from space," Jean-Loup Chretien said. "On the very first orbit I looked forward with special excitement to the moment when I could see France. Seeing one's homeland from space fills you with an inexpressible feeling. I did not expect that populated localities, roads and rivers would be seen so clearly."

He said that weightlessness does not interfere with his work in orbit and he is able to carry out a large program of space research. "One can perform such stunts here," he said of the advantages of weightlessness, "which will never be done by the most able acrobat on earth."

"Weightlessness gives us real enjoyment," Soviet cosmonaut Anatoliy Berezovoy, who is working for the first time in the extreme conditions of space, shared his impressions. "After the transfer to the station where one can orient himself by the floor and the ceiling," he went on, "everything fell into its proper place."

"We all liked very much dishes of French cuisine which were taken into orbit by the international crew," said Anatoliy Berezovoy. "Pate de Campagne was a special success with everybody. In my opinion, this dish is worth space grandeur."

"There is no problem of working space in our orbiting home," he went on. "The station is spacious. There is enough room for everybody."

"Judging by all, the hosts waited for us, waiting eagerly," Aleksandr Ivanchenko remarked with gratitude.

"We have two flight engineers aboard now and it is twice as easy to work than before," said Valentin Lebedev. He noted the fact that it is apparently for the first time ever that two graduates of Moscow's Aviation Institute are working in orbit together.

The international crew of the orbiting research complex Salyut-7 - Soyuz T-5 - Soyuz T-6 answered several more questions from Soviet and French journalists in the second half of the space press conference in another communications session.

"The first stage of the scientific experiments in space is proceeding successfully," said Vladimir Dzhanibekov. "Checks have demonstrated the excellent state of the equipment which was brought aboard." Jean-Loup Chretien was asked what he would have said had he met somebody from extraterrestrail civilisations. He said his reaction would be: "We here are the children of the same planet of earth. Come in, you are welcome." According to Chretien, he is proud of being the first citizen of France in outer space and was very moved by the hospitality accorded to him by the host crew and the assistance from his Soyuz-6 colleagues. "I highly appreciate their capacity for work, courage and experience which they share so generously with me," the French cosmonaut said.

The spacemen reported they have had another new arrival to the station who is now circling the earth together with them. They said he was Vanyusha, the name they gave to one of the many Matreshka dolls which the international crew had presented to the station's hosts. The dolls were made by craftsmen of the Gorkiy region. There the Volga flows, whom the cosmonauts warmly congratulated on the 50th anniversary of their factory.

FURTHER EUROPEAN REACTION TO U.S. GAS PIPES BAN

EEC 'Indignation'

LD281526 Moscow TASS in English 1503 GMT 28 Jun 82

["Indignation at Washington's Measures" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS -- TASS commentator Yevgeniy Kiselev writes:

The decision of the U.S. President Reagan to broaden and toughen the ban on deliveries of equipment for the construction of the Siberia-Western Europe gas pipeline countinues giving rise to indignation in capital cities of West European countries. Leaders of West European countries intend to discuss Washington's steps at the coming two-day Common Market summit meeting in Brussels which opens today.

The cause of particular indignation of leaders of West European countries is that Reagan's decision was adopted -- in violation of the normal procedure -- without consulting them, just a fortnight after the economic summit conference of the leaders of seven biggest capitalist countries in Versailles and the NATO high level session in Bonn. At these conferences, West Europeans believe, an understanding was reached as to Western would-be course towards the Soviet Union.

In West European countries they believe not without ground that President Reagan's ban would hardly delay the construction of the gas pipeline, but it is sure to inflict major damage upon many West European companies which will be deprived of advantageous Soviet orders and will be compelled to curtail production. And this will entail dismissal of thousands of workers, and, consequently, further aggravation of the grave socio-political problem of mass unemployment in West European countries.

The number of the unemployed is more than 10 million in Common Market countries now.

The action of the U.S. administration is regarded in the capitals of West European states as gross interference into their internal affairs. The spreading of the ban on deliveries of equipment for the gas pipeline to companies which manufacture such equipment by American licenses is a matter of outright diktat. It is not for nothing that foreign ministers of Common Market countries announced that the step of the White House was contrary to the principles of international law and unacceptable to the EEC.

In connection with the conference in Brussels Western mass media write about a "crisis" in the relations between the United States and Common Market countries, about the threat of "trade warfare" between them. Western Europe's relations with the United States are taking on point not only because of the "gas-pipes" deal. The cause of West Europeans' indignation and annoyance are also such aspects of the Reagan administration's foreign-economic policy as measures to restrict American import of European steel and agricultural products, the growing bank rates and the overstated exchange value rate of the U.S. dollar.

The near future will show whether West European countries will be able to oppose American diktat and interference into their internal affairs.

FRG Criticism

LD281848 Moscow TASS in English 1653 GMT 28 Jun 82

[Text] Bonn June 28 TASS -- The decision by the Reagan administration to extend discriminatory economic measures against the Soviet Union and to draw the United States' West European partners into this dangerous policy touched off a wave of indignation in the political, business and public circles of the FRG.

Reagan's actions, designed to resume the "economic war" against the USSR, meet with strong opposition among West German business circles, says the influential magazine DER SPIEGEL. It says that filling Soviet orders means keeping in jobs thousands of working people in Federal Germany and that in a situation marked by a slump in the West German economy, this deal may even keep in business a number of firms and enterprises.

"Washington's actions are damaging to the international division of labour," says H. Durr, president of the board of AEG-Telefunken. This concern has received a big order for equipment for the trunk Siberia-West Europe gas pipeline and this deal will help it preserve thousands of jobs at its plants.

Reagan's decision jeopardises the existing system of technological license exchanges. Such decisions may have serious political consequences and affect East-West relations as well as relations between West Europe and the United States, O. Wolf von Amerongen, president of the German Industrial and Trade Association said in a DER SPIEGEL interview.

"The U.S. actions are irresponsible. Its attempts to reverse the development of world trade are simply unbearable," W. Haas, one of the leaders of the land organization of the German Trade Union Federation, said in Dusseldorf. "Reagan's decisions are directed against the interests of our workers and whole branches of industry," he stressed.

O. Lambsdorff, minister of economics, stressed again that the Federal Republic of Germany is interested in the realization of the gas-pipes project. Speaking in an interview with the WDR [West Deutscher Rundfunk] television company in Cologne, the minister said: "The United States' actions may create some difficulties for the realization of this deal but there is no doubt that the countries participating in this project are well in a position technically to carry it out."

COMMENTARY ON SPANISH POSITION ON GIBRALTAR

LD271958 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 27 Jun 82

[Text] According to reports from Madrid, the Spanish public reacted with great concern to the news of a new postponement of the long-planned talks with Britain on the question of the fate of the British colony of Gibraltar, our commentator notes.

The talks on the future of Gibraltar, which were to resume on 25 June after a prolonged interruption, were postponed for an indefinite period. Despite Spain's obvious interest in conducting the talks, the decision to postpone them was taken on the initiative of the Spanish side. Why has this happened? The point is that, as British Prime Minister Thatcher stated, her government does not intend to discuss with the Spaniards the question of sovereignty over Gibraltar, and the Spaniards consider precisely the settlement of that problem to be the main point of the talks. The territory of Gibraltar has been torn away from Spain, to which it never agreed, for almost three centuries. Twenty years ago, the United Nations Organization appealed for the adoption of measures for the decolonization of that British possession. Finally, Britain seemed to agree, not at all long ago, to discuss the question of the future of Gibraltar with a view to settling the problem in the spirit of the wishes of the Spanish side, which was demanding that the territory be returned.

Supporters of Spain's entry into NATO asserted that, in joining that aggressive military and political bloc, the urgency of the Gibraltar question would be reduced, and the path would be open to integrating Gibraltar with Spain. These calculations turned out to be built upon sand. Some days ago, a representative of the ruling Spanish party, the Union of the Democratic Center, (Roberos), noted that the British Government does not intend to conduct genuine talks, and that Spain sees no need to participate in pseudo-talks. Practice shows that, after the crisis in the South Atlantic, where London resorted to crude force against Argentina, the position of the British Government has also hardened in relation to Gibraltar. This clearly shows the true value of Great Britain's statements about a constructive approach to the resolution of controversial international questions.

The hopes of the Spanish Government for NATO support are not being justified, either. Luns, the secretary general of the bloc, stated categorically that the future of Gibraltar is a question only of bilateral relations between Spain and Britain, and that NATO does not intend to interfere in its settlement. It is plain from the statement by Luns that it is completely to NATO's liking that Gibraltar remains under the control of Britain, a faithful ally of the United States. Spain has lost the opportunity to insist on its rights. The Spaniards are already in NATO, and must now take into account bloc discipline. This all leads to the fact that the position of the Spanish Government is now significantly more complex. The fact is that the Spanish Socialist Workers' Party, which is in opposition, demanded that the government present the necessary explanation to parliament of what happened.

GREECE'S 'SPECIAL RELATIONSHIP' WITH NATO

LD251340 Moscow in Greek to Greece 1800 GMT 24 Jun 82

[Text] General Carlini, commander of NATO land forces in southern Europe, has been in Athens. According to reports in the Greek press he discussed with representatives of the Greek General Staff the problems of Athens' participation in the military wing of the North Atlantic bloc. Our commentator writes:

Recently, NATO generals and top officials from various staffs of the bloc have started visiting Greece frequently. The frequency of these visits especially increased following the recent visit to Athens by the Supreme Commander of NATO Allied Forces in Europe American Gen Bernard Rogers and by Alexander Haig, who formerly occupied this post and who has now exchanged the military uniform for the civilian dress of leader of the American State Department.

What is it then that Washington and NATO want from Greece? They demand that the Greeks once again become obedient and well-disciplined soldiers in the lines of the North Atlantic army. The United States and NATO blatantly behave in a manner implying that allegedly no change has taken place in the country's foreign and domestic policy despite the coming to power in Athens of the socialist government. It is clear that they want once again to drive Greece to the NATO military camps, as they did in 1980 through in fact none other than this Mr Rogers himself, whose current subordinate, General Carlini, probably tried to persuade the intransigent Greek ally to accept without question the [words indistinct].

However, the following question arises: Why is it at exactly this moment that the United States and NATO have decided to tighten their grip round their junior ally? The point is that last autumn Athens maintained a reasonably firm anti-NATO stance and even proposed the issue of the country's withdrawal from NATO. However, little by little the former firmness was moderated and already there is talk about the so-called special relationship of Greece in the framework of the North Atlantic bloc.

The inconsistent policy followed by Athens in its relations with NATO is also testified by the fact that warships of the Greek Navy are now taking part in the exercises of the bloc naval forces code-named Daily Double 1 -82, which are under the command of American Admiral Crowe who also paid an official visit to the Greek capital a few months ago.

We believe, however, that there is a (?far-sighted) aspect to the hard line of the United States and NATO toward Greece. In making an example of it they show the other West European countries and peoples that despite internal-political changes, their military-strategic interests must be precisely preserved. This is a future lesson for everyone. In this connection we cannot fail to recall the perspicacity shown in the words of General de Gaulle who in removing France from NATO said that participation in this organization would make any country dependent on the caprices of American foreign policy. Seventeen years have passed since those words were uttered, but they have not lost their topicality, especially in the light of the present adventurist policy of the White House in the international arena, our commentator concludes.

BREZHNEV CONGRATULATES PORTUGUESE ON NATIONAL DAY

LD281710 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 28 Jun 82

[Text] Leonid Ilich Brezhnev sent a telegram to General Antonio dos Santos Ramalho Eanes, president of the Portuguese Republic, in which he conveyed congratulations and good wishes on the occasion of the country's national holiday, Portugal Day, to him and the friendly Portuguese people. In a reply telegram the president of Portugal expressed his sincere gratitude for the congratulations and the good wishes.

CPSU DELEGATION ATTENDS UNSERE ZEIT FESTIVAL

PM280749 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 82 p 4

[TASS report: "Fraternal Paper's Festival"]

[Text] Duisburg, 18 Jun -- A colorful and noisy town has sprung up on the ("Vedau") sports complex premises in this major center of the industrial Ruhr. Massive canvas pavilions for meetings and discussions, information stands, book stalls, a children's area -- all this was constructed by thousands of German Communist Party (DKP) activists for the traditional festival of the DKP's organ, UNSERE ZEIT.

"We are holding our festival in Duisburg, a city of steelworkers, a city of people who do heavy work," said G. Polikeit, member of the DKP board Presidium and chief editor of UNSERE ZEIT at the festival opening. "Our festival's main slogan is Peace, Detente and Disarmament."

The festival of the workers paper is being attended by representatives of a number of foreign communist parties, including a CPSU delegation headed by I.S. Gustov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee.

HUSAYN EXCHANGES VIEWS WITH SOVIET LEADERS

LD281634 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 28 Jun 82

[From "Window on the Arab World"]

[Text] The monarch of Jordan, King Husayn, has ended his unofficial visit to the Soviet Union. In the course of the visit, His Majesty conducted talks with Nikolay Tikhonov, head of the Soviet Government, and with Andrey Gromyko, the Soviet foreign minister. There was an exchange of views on the issues of Soviet-Jordanian relations, Middle East and other international issues. Both sides expressed satisfaction with the existing state of relations between the two countries, and they expressed the desire to promote these relations.

King Husayn expressed gratitude to the Soviet Union for its aid to and support for the just Arab struggle against Israel's policy of occupation and for the freedom of the Arabs [word indistinct].

Leaders of both the Soviet Union and Jordan strongly condemned the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the occupation of the Lebanese territories, the piracy and barbarism of the aggressors against the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples, and the Israeli aggression against Syria. The Soviet Union and Jordan also declared that the Israeli attack on Lebanon is a direct continuation of the strategic cooperation between Washington and Tel Aviv, and of the Camp David course of separate deals.

Both countries demanded an immediate halt to the Israeli aggression against Lebanon and the withdrawal of the Israeli forces from its territories on the basis of the relevant UN Security Council resolutions. The Soviet and Jordanian leaders firmly expressed the need to preserve the sovereignty of Lebanon, its independence and its territorial integrity, and to ensure the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian Arab people, including their right to self-determination and to set up their own state.

The Soviet Union and Jordan stressed the importance of (?intensifying) the efforts of all Arab countries and of all the Arabs at this difficult moment to stand up to the aggressors with a unified stance and with one will.

Husayn Departs

LD281700 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 1300 GMT 28 Jun 82

[Text] Husayn ibn Talal, king of Jordan, and Queen Nur, who were in the Soviet Union to rest and familiarize themselves with the country, left Moscow for Amman today. They were seen off at the airport by Comrade Yazkuliyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Comrade Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and other officials.

PLO OFFICIAL SAYS ISRAELIS USING NERVE GAS

LD282016 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1730 GMT 28 Jun 82

[Text] Yasir 'Abd Rabbu, member of the PLO Executive Committee, is currently visiting the Soviet Union. Today he met with Soviet journalists representing the local Moscow media.

Yasir 'Abd Rabbu, in evaluating the situation in and around Lebanon, first noted the failure of the blitzkrieg which the Israeli aggressor and his strategic ally, the United States, hoped to realize. Despite the fact that Israel had sent 11 mechanized and armored divisions and all its air force and naval forces against the Palestinian resistance and the Lebanese patriotic forces and the Syrian forces, Israel cannot destroy the heroic resistance of the Palestinians, the Lebanese and Syrians.

The PLO official also said that the U.S. and Israeli aggressors will not be able to frighten the Arabs who are fighting in Lebanon by using chemical weapons and nerve gas. Yasir 'Abd Rabbu noted that there is nothing that can force the Palestinians and the patriotic Lebanese forces to lay down their arms before the aggressors.

In exposing the distant objectives of the United States and Israel in Lebanon, he said that among such objectives there is not only the one that seeks to liquidate the Palestinian resistance, but also the physical liquidation of the Palestinian people. The United States and Israel are trying to bring Lebanon to its knees and to impose the Camp David capitulationist deal on it.

Syria might become the next target. Israel, after Lebanon, intends to direct its guns and missiles at Damascus and overthrow the current regime there and force Syria to join the Camp David deal. The aggressors intend in the end to establish the U.S. imperialist domination over all the area of the Middle East.

Yasir 'Abd Rabbu highly appreciated the importance of international solidarity in the struggle to end the aggression in Lebanon and against mass extermination of the Palestinian people. He noted that the great majority of the countries in the world whose delegates at the United Nations fully supported the just cause of the Palestinian and Lebanese people set a mark of disgrace on Israel and the United States. He said: This gives an inspiration to the Palestinians and the Lebanese patriotic forces to continue their heroic resistance to the aggressors.

The PLO official in particular noted the fact that the Soviet Union and the other socialist states firmly opposed in words and deeds the U.S.-Israeli aggression in Lebanon and demanded that it must stop immediately and defended the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian and Lebanese people. At the same time, Yasir 'Abd Rabbu called on the patriotic progress forces in the Arab world to provide decisive aid for the Palestinians and the Lebanese who are gallantly and heroically fighting the aggressors inflicting heavy losses on them.

ARAB FOREIGN MINISTERS END TUNIS CONFERENCE

LD272140 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 27 Jun 82

[Text] Tunis June 27 TASS -- An extraordinary conference of the Arab foreign ministers has ended in Tunisia. Its participants discussed the situation now obtaining in Lebanon and also questions of consolidation of efforts of the Arab states towards termination of blockade of Beirut and withdrawal of the Israeli troops from Lebanon. The Arab foreign ministers passed a decision to form a committee to put into life the U.N. resolutions on Lebanon and for preparations for an extraordinary Arab summit meeting. The committee, which includes the foreign ministers of Algeria, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Syria, the Lebanon and also a representative of the Palestine Liberation Organization, has got down to work.

SAUDI KING FAHD SENDS MESSAGE TO BREZHNEV

LD281602 Moscow TASS in English 1504 GMT 28 Jun 82

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS -- The King of Saudi Arabia Fahd ibn 'Abd al-Aziz al-Saud has sent a message to Leonid Brezhnev, expressing condolences over the recent death of King Khalid ibn 'Abd al-Aziz al-Saud. [sentence as received]

TASHKENT ON U.S. INTENTIONS IN LEBANON

GF281622 Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 27 Jun 82

[Unattributed commentary: "The Situation in the Middle East"]

[Text] Israel has been engaged in an unprecedented aggression against Lebanon for 3 weeks now. The 100,000-strong army of the aggressor has violated Lebanon's borders and occupied half that country. Cities and towns are burning. Tens of thousands of peace-loving people have either been killed or wounded. Hundreds of thousands of people have become homeless.

It is no coincidence that numerous civilians have been killed. This may have been the intention of the invader. Actually, the intention of the invader is to destroy the Palestinian people -- in other words, to kill them. Thousands of Lebanese are also being killed by Israeli bombs and artillery shells. Obviously, Lebanon's existence as a state and its independence and territorial integrity are being threatened.

But how do the (?champions of) peace in Washington assess these developments? They have been talking about their opposition to every kind of aggression and have been expressing preparedness to safeguard human rights against any kind of threat. Are they condemning this military intervention? Are they (?imposing) economic sanctions against the aggressor and condemning it in the political domain? No, there has been nothing in this direction. In fact, at a time when Lebanon was experiencing a disastrous state of affairs, Reagan received Begin in Washington as a loyal friend.

The current tragedy in Lebanon is the direct outcome of the Camp David Accords. This tragedy is the (?manifestation) of those accords. Israel is currently trying to realize its intention through the use of arms -- an intention it failed to put into effect through its talks with Egypt. It is contemplating destroying the PLO by [word indistinct] the Palestinians. The political goal behind the Camp David Accords is to take revenge on the Arab states and force them to obey imperialist policies.

The armed intervention in Lebanon is actually aimed at strengthening political cooperation between Washington and Tel Aviv. The invader and its guardian are planning to deploy their military units in the occupied Lebanese territory under the guise of a multinational force. The bulk of this force will be composed of U.S. troops. In other words, the U.S. Marines are currently endeavoring through the Israeli militarists to realize what they failed to do in 1958. Tel Aviv, whose tendency to get involved in bloody aggressions is similar to that of Washington, is offering a new space in the Middle East to U.S. militarists. This military space is [words indistinct] in Sinai by the United States. Meanwhile, the champions of peace in Washington can find nothing to say over the [words indistinct] of thousands of people who have been killed in the tragic incidents in Lebanon.

UZBEK PEOPLE PROTEST ISRAELI ACTIONS IN LEBANON

GF281338 Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 27 Jun 82

[Text] Protest meetings against Israel's aggressive moves on Lebanese soil continue to be organized in Uzbek cities and towns. Toilers of industrial factories, organizations, kolkhozes and sovkhozes have been expressing great concern over the (?crimes) being committed in Lebanon by Israeli invaders under U.S. protection. The participants of these meetings are demanding an immediate end to clashes in Lebanon, followed by the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the country.

PRC POLICY ON IRAN, PERSIAN GULF ASSAILED

NC262129 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1630 GMT 25 Jun 82

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] In his speech at the UN General Assembly special session on disarmament, PRC Foreign Minister Huang Hua actually justified U.S. imperialism's policy of escalating the arms race. His remarks were at odds with remarks made by Iranian Foreign Minister Velayati and representatives of other developing countries, who strongly condemned the U.S. plicy of an arms race and of arms exports. As an example, Mr Velayati said arms exports are in general aimed at defending despotism and at crushing Third World nations.

Iran has learned, through its experiences, what U.S. arms means. The Iranian people paid a very high price for these arms. The monarchy not only paid billions of dollars belonging to the Iranian toilers -- the true owners of Iran's oil wealth -- to the United States, but the rotten monarchy itself was propped up by U.S. arms and U.S. bayonets. It was with these same U.S. arms that the shah and his toadies attacked Iranian patriots and drowned Iran's liberation struggle in blood.

Iranians can never forget how Hua Kuofeng, the leader of the PRC Government, amicably embraced Mohammad Reza Shah, the executioner of the Iranian nation, when he came to Iran. According to press reports at the time, the Chinese leader especially urged Iran to buy as many U.S. arms as possible so that Washington and the monarchy could gain the title of sovereign in the Persian Gulf.

As you know, the shah had sent the Iranian forces to help the Omani ruler, Sultan Qabus, to crush the national liberation movement there. It is therefore clear why China's approach to Iran's antimonarchical revolution was hostile. The propsect of the growth and development of a strong and independent Iran does not fit into the plans of the Chinese leaders.

As stated by the Lebanese weekly AS-SAYYAD, the revolutionary happenings in Iran upset the plans of the Chinese, which were to come close to the warm waters of Persian Gulf, which smell of oil. This is why Beijing supported all the U.S. hostilities against Iran, including the perfidious fiasco of the U.S. aircraft and helicopter attack in the desert.

Despite the interests of Iran and of other countries of the Persian Gulf, China flagrantly supported the expansion of the U.S. Armed Forces in this region. Has Beijing's stance now altered? Speaking at the UN General Assembly special session on disarmament, Soviet Foreign Minister Andrey Gromyko said: The large U.S. fleet was sent to the Persian Gulf amidst a great deal of commotion on the pretext of defending U.S. vital interests. Those who wanted to use force and threats to turn Iran into a puppet again failed. Andrey Gromyko stressed: Nevertheless, this fleet is still there.

Not only does Beijing not oppose these aggressive acts by the United States but, on the contrary, as can be concluded from material appearing in the U.S. press, its leaders insist on expanding and strengthening the U.S. military presence in the Persian Gulf, increasing the number of ships in the U.S. fleet and establishing extra U.S. military bases in this region. Apparently Beijing believes that the more the United States escalates the arms race in the Persian Gulf, the more the political and military situation in the region will be strained. This will lead to military conflicts which, in turn, will weaken the Persian Gulf states and allow Beijing to intensify its infiltration.

Like the other countries of the region, Iran, too, decisively wants to turn the Persian Gulf into an area of peace and fruitful international cooperation. Beijing's stance, which assists the imperialists' militarization of this region, has nothing on common with the interests of peace-loving countries. Beijing's stance conforms completely with the hostile policy of the United States toward Iran.

NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS SEMINAR ASSESSED

NC262207 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1630 GMT 25 Jun 82

[Igor Sheftunov commentary]

[Excerpts] An international seminar on national liberation movements was recently held in Iran. The participants pointed out the need to intensify the struggle against imperialism and Zionism. There were also speakers from among the so-called progressive Iranian clergymen who attempted to claim that the cooperation among national liberation movements, the Soviet Union and other countries of the socialist bloc is harmful. If this cooperation between anti-imperialist forces is harmful, it is only harmful to those who, in one way or other, want former colonialist norms and systems to be preserved and who do not want liberated nations to be allowed to have their say in their own home.

It is not without reason that at all the imperialist summits, including the last one in Versailles, participants go to such extremes to upset the unity between liberated countries and socialist countries. The imperialist and Zionist camps are well aware of the fact that each time combatant nations take action toward freedom and independence together with socialist countries, their forces are multiplied.

The solidarity of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries with the Iranian nation's freedom-seeking struggle was of greater importance for the victory of the antimonarchical revolution. Brzezinski and other leaders of the U.S. administration headed by Carter inevitably confessed that the Soviet Union's decisive warning that our country will not tolerate foreign intervention in Iran's internal affairs made Washington abandon its intention of carrying out direct armed intervention against the risen Iranian nation.

Meanwhile, experience shows that imperialism succeeds in inflicting blows on the revolutionary gains of those nations that have strayed away from the forces of freedom and progress. The best example of this is Egypt.

Under the present circumstances when Israel, encouraged and incited by the United States, has started a war against the nations of Palestine and Lebanon, the solidarity of all anti-imperialist forces gains great importance. This is a reality especially understood by those who have been targets of the aggressors' blows.

The situation created by the U.S. and Israeli aggression is such that the behavior and view of each country, party or social organization on anti-imperialist unity allows one to judge who is truly defending the freedom and independence of nations by deeds and not by words.

The recent gathering of international representatives held in the Libyan capital, Tripoli, in order to discuss the establishment of an international center for steadfastness against imperialism, Zionism, reaction and fascism clearly showed the views of a variety of political parties, social organizations and national liberation movements on solidarity in a common struggle for independence and freedom.

The participants in this conference, in which representatives from more than 80 countries were present, emphasized the great role of the Soviet Union and of socialist bloc countries in the anti-imperialist struggle.

What can be said about the Soviet Union is that in the future, too, it will always support the anti-imperialist struggles of nations. As stated in the 26th CPSU Congress, the Soviet Union will persistently pursue a policy of expanding and developing cooperation with liberated countries and consolidating the bonds and unity between world socialism and national liberation movements.

S. AFRICA DREAMS OF SATO ROLE AFTER FALKLANDS

PM281041 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 22 Jun 82 p 3

[V. Golubev "International Notes": "The Racists' Shaky Calculations"]

[Text] The bloody drama played out in the Falkland (Malvinas) Islands according to London's scenario and the brazen Israeli aggression being implemented with Washington's complete support are arousing rapture among the South African racists. They hope that these events will bring closer the NATO "hour of glory" for Pretoria, which has long dreamed of joining one of the Western blocs to organize large-scale aggression against Angola. That is why South Africa expresses its readiness to make available to the West the naval bases at Simonstown and Durban, which, according to Adm H. Train, commander in chief of U.S. Armed Forces in the Atlantic Ocean zone, could be integrated "into the NATO defense system."

Let us recall that the Simonstown base has three docks and is capable of taking 40 medium-size and 7 large ships simultaneously, including submarines. Silvermine, near Simonstown, is the center of the (Advokat) military radar system, which has departments in Durban and the Namibian port of Walvis Bay. This system monitors the entire air and sea space from the Tropic of Cancer to the South Pole.

It is not suprising that the racists themselves and the Americans and British have always assigned to Simonstown a leading role in the plan to create a so-called South Atlantic treaty organization (SATO). However, whereas the Chilean junta greeted these plans with rapture, in Argentina and Brazil they met with a firm rebuff. That is why the West and Pretoria have an interest in destabilizing the regimes in those countries.

Pretoria's current desire to join the Anglo-American "company" in the South Atlantic is also fanned by hopes tht Washington and London will further increase aid to the racist regime. And they are making no mistake in their calculations. Both countries are helping South Africa to lord it in Namibia and are helping to create Pretoria's nuclear potential. It was the United States and Britain which played a considerable role in ensuring that the numerical strength of South Africa's army increased 16-fold in the last 20 years. After all, all this gang of cutthroats had to be supplied with machinery and to be armed. It recently became known that the U.S. administration permitted the American Control Data Corporation to sell South Africa computers which could be used, for instance, to calculate nuclear charges. South Africa also continues to receive military-technical supplies through secret channels, in particular through the American private company Space Research Corporation, which has already supplied the racists with 155-mm howitzers and shells. American exports to South Africa increased 50 percent in 1981 compared with 1980.

Finally, what remains to be mentioned is the West's huge role in strengthening South America's economy, which is extremely dependent on the supply of capital and modern machinery from outside. Foreign capital investments in South Africa have already reached $30 billion, of which more than $2 billion is American investment. The profit on $1 invested by American monopolies has reached, for instance, $9-$14 in Namibia.

However, the Pretoria racists will not live to see their "hour of glory." Whereas even before the British aggression in the South Atlantic, SATO was a stillborn organization, now the wrath of Latin America will turn dreams of a new bloc with South African participation totally to ashes.

KISELEV ADDRESSES BRAZIL CONGRESS ON DISARMAMENT

PY260355 Moscow in Portuguese to Brazil 2200 GMT 22 Jun 82

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by Tikhon Kiselev, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, which is on an official friendship visit to Brazil, today visited the Brazilian Congress.

Upon receiving the Soviet parliamentary delegation Nelson Marchezan, president of the Chamber of Deputies of the National Congress, voiced his belief that their visit to Brazil will contribute to strengthening the friendship and cooperation between the two countries and the mutual understanding between Brazilian and Soviet peoples.

Tikhon Kiselev talked about the Soviet peoples' life, the activities of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Soviet Union's struggle for peace and international security.

After reporting on the recent Soviet initiatives regarding foreign policy, he pointed out that the current world concern is to prevent a thermonuclear war.

After pointing out that the Soviet Union and Brazil have coinciding or similar points of view regarding many important current issues, Tikhon Kiselev pointed out that this contributes to the broadening of cooperation in foreign policy and also to the development of bilateral relations in the economic, trade and cultural fields, among others.

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation was received by Jarbas Passarinho, president of the National Congress and the Senate. He stated that the exchange of congressional delegations between the Soviet Union and Brazil is very advantageous and a sign of the good relations between the two countries.

The USSR delegation, on behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet, conveyed [words indistinct] to the Brazilian people for the fulfillment of tasks aimed at socioeconomic development.

The members of the delegation referred to the USSR peace-seeking foreign policy and to some aspects of the Soviet Union's domestic policy.

The head of the Soviet delegation, on behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet, invited the leaders of the National Congress to send a congressional delegation on an official visit to the Soviet Union. Thanks for the invitation was given and it was accepted.

The Foreign Relations Committee of the Chamber of Deputies held a special meeting marking the visit being paid by the Soviet parliamentarians. In his speech made on the occasion Raymundo Diniz, president of the committee, stated that the visit of the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation to Brazil will contribute to the cause of peace and progress throughout the entire world. He then stated that the relationship between the two countries, regardless of their socio-political differences, should be based on mutual understanding and equality.

Flavio Marcilio, honorary president of the Foreign Affairs Committee, stated that the desire for peace is what unites the members of the congresses of the two countries. We are convinced that our countries should act jointly in the struggle for the fulfillment of this task, which is one of the most important at present.

In his speech the leader of the Soviet delegation stated that the Soviet parliamentarians in their practical activities abide by the Leninist guidelines which were established in one of the first documents drawn up by the Soviet Government, the decree (?which establishes that) one must do one's utmost in order to increase cooperation with all countries based on the principles of peaceful coexistence, nonintervention, respect for the sovereign rights of other peoples and the development of mutually advantageous cooperation. These guidelines of Soviet state policy stem from the very nature of our society, of the socialist regime.

Tikhon Kiselev stated that in the international area the Soviet Union has made efforts and continues to make them aimed at a decisive solution to the world situation, at strengthening detente, at reducing the level of military confrontations and at obtaining concrete bilateral as well as multilateral treaties and agreements.

The consequent position of Soviet principles favoring talks regarding the limitation and reduction of strategic arms is well known. At the same time that we term the U.S. agreement to start those talks positive, we cannot avoid regretting the fact that the process of limiting strategic arsenals has been interrupted -- not because of us -- for so long, since it was not a mere pause in the negotiations because the United States, during that period, continued to increase intensely its programs and military readiness.

Tikhon Kiselev then added that this is why, in the first place, we propose reaching an agreement on freezing of the current level of strategic arms so that the negotiations will not become a sort of coverup of the continuation of the arms race.

Tikhon Kiselev stated that neither can we forget that to date the agreements reached regarding disarmament continue to be blocked. Examples of this are the treaty regarding underground nuclear explosions as well as the talks regarding various important issues on disarmament, such as the prohibition of using chemical weapons and the reduction of military forces in the Indian Ocean, among others.

The USSR position at the second special session of the UN General Assembly regarding disarmament clearly confirms the unwavering peace-seeking policy and peaceful cooperation between the countries. This position is reflected in the message sent by Leonid Brezhnev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and president of the USSR Supreme Soviet, to those taking part at the session and in a USSR memorandum regarding the elimination of the increasing nuclear threat and the need to end the arms race contained in a speech made at this session by Andrey Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Soviet foreign minister.

The main objective of the new Soviet initiatives is aimed at preserving and increasing world peace, in guaranteeing the peoples' security and preventing a nuclear war.

A step of great importance is the fact that the Soviet Union has decided to undertake, by (?decision) of its chief of state, the solemn commitment not to be the first country to resort to nuclear arms. This is a unilateral decision, and if other nuclear powers were to follow its example, the chances of nuclear war breaking out would be reduced to zero.

Tikhon Kiselev concluded by voicing his hope that this initiative will [passage indistinct].

LEADERS DISCUSS MAY PLENUM, FOOD PROGRAM

Gorbachev in Yaroslavl

PM290811 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Jun 82 pp 1-2

[Unnamed TASS special correspondent report: "With High Exactingness"]

[Text] Yaroslavl, 16 Jun -- Today's party obkom plenum discussed the results of the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) plenum and the oblast party organization tasks in fulfilling its decisions and Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's instructions and recommendations.

M.S. Gorbachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who addressed the obkom plenum, was warmly greeted by those present.

The party Central Committee, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Comrade L.I. Brezhnev personally attach special significance to the results of the Central Committee May (1982) plenum, he stressed. The food question, which was examined at the plenum, is directly linked with the implementation of the vast program for the country's socioeconomic development and for increasing the Soviet people's prosperity. It is vitally necessary for our successful progress.

In terms of the scale of the tasks, the scope of the problems and the character of the measures outlined, the Central Committee May plenum will undoubtedly be of historic significance for the future of the agrarian sector and the country's overall economic life. The plenum ratified the USSR Food Program for the period through 1990 and approved a number of major CPSU Central Committee and government resolutions. These documents meet the objective requirements of the development of agricultural production and of the whole agroindustrial complex and create favorable conditions for the further development of production forces in this sphere of the economy.

The high standard on which the plenum was conducted and its fruitful results were ensured by thorough preparation and the in-depth elaboration of all problems with the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and the USSR Council of Ministers. The success of this work was determined by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's personal participation and direct leadership. Leonid Ilich contributed tremendous work to the formulation of the programs that were put forward and with Leninist farsightedness defined the strategy and tactics of the struggle on the food front.

His report at the plenum enriches the theory and practice of communist building and is the basic guiding document for an understanding of the program character of the plenum's decisions. The report expresses the essence of the party's agrarian policy for the eighties, gives it a scientific basis and defines the principle avenues of work. It is a model for all our cadres of the Leninist approach to understanding the paramount significance of food reserves.

It can already be said that the May plenum's decisions will influence the country's life and economy as much as those of the CPSU Central Committee March (1965) plenum did in their time. The decisions and documents adopted there are a further creative development of agrarian policy in light of the profound changes occurring in our economy, in the agroindustrial complex itself and in the Soviet peoples' material well-being. Taking society's urgent needs into account, we are now setting higher goals and putting the Food Program on a more solid base.

The plenum's decisions proceed from a recognition of the tremendous role of agriculture and all the agroindustrial complex sectors in the country's life.

At present agriculture produces over 28 percent of the country's national income and the agrarian complex as a whole provides 46 percent of the surplus product.

And when we speak of difficulties [ostrota] with some types of food, that does not mean that we are marking time in matters of increasing production. Average annual gross output in the 10th 5-Year Plan totaled nearly R124 billion. This is 50 percent more than in the 5-year plan preceding the March plenum. Our achievements are the real basis on which the Food Program rests.

We must regard the program's targets, and they are very high, as a minimum, the speaker continued. Practical work both in the country as a whole and in each sector must be conducted so as to overfulfill those targets. This presupposes that most active participation in increasing food resources by every kolkhoz and sovkhoz, all categories of farms, every rayon, oblast and republic. All areas of the country must make the maximum contribution to this nationwide cause.

An important place is assigned to the RSFSR's Non-Chernozem Zone in this plan. The party and state are showing great concern for its economic development. Several years ago a large long-term program was formulated for developing the zone's agriculture and improving housing and cultural and consumer service construction in its villages and hamlets. The state is channeling sizable funds and physical resources into these aims. Almost as much capital investment was allocated during the 10th 5-Year Plan as was assimilated during the previous 10 years. About 90 million tons of mineral fertilizers were supplied. This was 30 percent more than in the previous 5-year plan.

The technical base of kolkhozes, sovkhozes and land reclamation and construction organizations has strengthened markedly and the front of work to transform the Non-Chernozem Zone has broadened considerably. Some 3.2 million hectares of land were reclaimed and hundreds of major production installations were constructed here in the past 5-year period. More well-equipped housing, children's preschool institutions, clubs and houses of culture, schools and hospitals, stores and hard-surfaced motor roads have begun to be commissioned. Villages and hamlets are becoming more attractive year by year and more young people are now staying to work in agriculture. All this has made it possible to increase the zone's production of grain, potatoes, vegetables, meat, milk, eggs and other products. In the near future the Non-Chernozem Zone's kolkhozes and sovkhozes should become larger and more reliable suppliers of agricultural products for the working people of this historically shaped region of major cities and industrial centers.

At least 21 million tons of milk, 4.4 million tons of livestock, carcass weight, 18 billion eggs, 26 million tons of potatoes, 4.6 million tons of vegetables and much other output must be produced here by the end of the 11th 5-Year Plan. During the 5-year period production of potatoes must increase 23 percent, vegetables 26 percent, meat 22 percent, milk 14 percent, eggs 21 percent and fiber flax 53 percent. Even larger-scale tasks must be resolved in the 12th 5-Year Plan.

The state is seeking out and allocating the greatest possible funds and resources for this. Over R39 billion of state and kolkhoz capital investments, or R7.5 billion more than in the 10th 5-Year Plan, are being channeled into developing the zone's agriculture in the current 5-year plan. Supplies of equipment and mineral fertilizers are increasing. All of this is creating a mighty material and technical base for progress.

It is now a matter of specific work to realize the created potential. I should like to recall Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's words: "It can be said without exaggeration that the intensification of agriculture will make it possible to considerably increase this zone's production forces and essentially, as it were, to open up new virgin lands in the European part of the Soviet Union."

This is a fundamental thesis. This is the guideline and high evaluation of the role of the RSFSR's Non-Chernozem Zone in strengthening the country's food stock which the work of local party, soviet and economic organs, scientific institutions and central ministries and departments should match up to.

The party Central Committee and the government attach great significance to measures by the country's republics, krays and oblasts to give fraternal assistance in resolving tasks in developing the Non-Chernozem Zone. This work is being conducted most vigorously by the organizations of Uzbekistan, Belorussia, Lithuania, Kirgizia, Stavropolskiy Kray, Rostovskaya and Kuybyshevskaya Oblasts and some other oblasts and republics. The Lenin Komsomol is doing a lot. Over 150,000 young volunteers have traveled to the zone on Komsomol warrants.

To put in a nutshell what is needed for the successful fulfillment of the Food Program targets, the task will be to sharply raise the scientific and technical standard and efficiency of production both actually in agriculture and in all the other components of the agroindustrial complex. The plenum documents draw particular attention to this.

Intensification is the main channel for increasing plant-growing and livestock-raising production in the eighties and subsequent years. The demand that more be produced with reduced expenditure of manpower and physical resources is growing with every passing year and should be the main thread running through all our measures and all our organizational and economic work.

The speaker then dwelt on the state of affairs in the oblast's agriculture. The experience of advanced links, teams, kolkhozes and sovkhozes indicates the great reserves for developing arable farming and stockraising more rapidly. However, the oblast as a whole is still increasing production only slowly. The capital investments and physical resources that are being allocated are not yielding the planned return. A check conducted by CPSU Central Committee sections shows that on many kolkhozes and sovkhozes arable farming standards are low, seed cultivation is badly organized and flagrant violations of agrotechnical requirements and the negligent use of equipment and mineral fertilizers are permitted. Only one-half to one-third the amount of organic fertilizers per hectare applied in many Non-Chernozem Zone oblasts and republics is being applied in the oblast. In terms of grain crop yield, the oblast is essentially marking time and rye production has actually fallen. Potato, flax, vegetable and onion harvests are also low. Many workers have become used to this and fail to make a critical assessment of their own work.

It is well known that under the Non-Chernozem Zone's conditions, land reclamation is the main element in the program for the accelerated development of agricultural production, but the oblast's investment plan for land reclamation in 1976-1981 was not fulfilled. Work on the radical improvement of natural fodder lands, which are the main source for the production of full-value coarse fodder, is being carried out particularly slowly. This must be rectified.

The assimilation of a rational arable farming system, the introduction of more productive strains and hybrids and new techniques of agricultural crop cultivation and the whole arsenal of modern agrotechnical resources and methods must serve the harvest. Even in this 5-year period the fulfillment of the plans requires that grain crop yield be raised by at least 3.5-4 quintals per hectare, potato yield by 55-60 quintals per hectare and fodder crop yield to the point where stockraising on kolkhozes and sovkhozes and by the population is fully provided with coarse and succulent fodder.

It is difficult to expect stockraising -- the leading sector of agricultural production -- to be boosted without major improvements in arable farming.

The oblast often has to ship in fodder from other regions and allocate increasing amounts of grain from state resources. The May plenum decisions demand a radical restructuring of work in this area.

Soviet people should appreciate the results of the implementation of the Food Program in the immediate future, even this year. It is very important that time is not wasted now. This applies to all areas of rural production. This year's task, the speaker stressed, is to achieve perceptible improvements in agriculture and to ensure the fulfillment of the set plans in terms of the production and procurement of grain and all types of agricultural output. A great deal more can be obtained if losses of output during harvesting, transportation, storage and processing are precluded and if the activity of all the departments, enterprises and organizations belonging to the agroindustrial complex is organized efficiently.

In a way, this year should be the first test showing how profoundly leaders and all workers of agricultural organizations and departments have understood and appreciated their role and responsibility for improving the population's food supply.

M.S. Gorbachev dwelt in detail on the role and significance of kolkhozes and sovkhozes and the basic component of the agroindustrial complex. Proposals for the organizational restructuring of the agroindustrial sector and for the creation of agroindustrial associations in rayons and oblasts and of commissions on problems of the agroindustrial complex in republics and in the central zone have been implemented in the interests of kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

Serious shortcomings have emerged in management recently, particularly at the oblast and republic levels. The shortcomings in this matter -- the growth of the management apparatus, the appearance of duplicate management components, the increase in the stream of paperwork and in the number of meetings, conferences and all sorts of calls -- must now be resolutely eliminated. At the same time the CPSU Central Committee and the government considered it necessary to greatly strengthen the rayon level. This is the level which is closest to all the production.

Party, soviet and economic departments face great tasks in connection with improving the economic mechanism. A number of major interrelated measures are to be implemented whose result should be to intensify autonomous financing in the countryside, increase the profitability of agricultural production and ensure efficient work by kolkhozes, sovkhozes and all agroindustrial complex enterprises.

The measures taken by the Central Committee May plenum are geared to improving the economic conditions of kolkhozes' and sovkhozes' work via an increase in purchase prices and more correct relations with service organizations and at the same time to stepping up their responsibility for ensuring more efficient and profitable work. The important task is to master new management methods. Figuratively speaking, each kolkhoz and sovkhoz must now earn the money to meet its own expenditure, provide more output and raise quality, struggle to reduce prime cost and save financial and physical resources. It is very important to ensure the correct application of the projected measures. The extra resources allocated are not to offset negligence and clumsy, thoughtless leadership, but are a powerful lever for developing production and stepping up agricultural workers' labor activity. Encouragement to achieve high end results should be the main form of material incentive.

Concern for the rural worker and for his working and living conditions is an urgent task whose solution requires tremendous work. The Central Committee May plenum deemed it necessary to give the matter of reorganizing the countryside a state and nationwide character.

It is the obligation of party organizations, soviets, trade unions and Komsomol and leaders of construction and industrial organizations in the oblast to make the maximum efforts and do their utmost to successfully implement this principled guideline of the Central Committee plenum. We cannot permit a failure to fulfill the plans for rural housing and cultural and consumer service construction in even a single oblast. Industrial enterprises and other urban organizations can and must make a large contribution here.

The speaker paid great attention to work with cadres under the new conditions and to their training, correct placement and stabilization in the countryside. It cannot be considered normal that some party committees have slackened the attention paid to the selection and training of kolkhoz and sovkhoz leaders and experts. The prestige and authority of this category of cadres must be fully restored. A creative approach to work, competence, work with a view to the long term, the ability to foresee a possible sequence of events and the struggle against inertia, obsolete forms and methods, formalism and stagnation are all integral requirements of a truly party-minded and Leninist work style.

We have to conduct agriculture under complex weather conditions, and it would be a mistake to expect the conditions to improve spontaneously in the future. All this must be taken into account in work with cadres. It is necessary to understand and take account of specific natural and climatic features more profoundly and to arrange planning, economic, agronomic and organizational work in such a way as to obtain good harvests every year.

The speaker placed urgent, pressing matters at the center of all concerns. Rural working people are now working actively everywhere in the fields and on livestock units in order to cultivate a good harvest of grain and fodder crops, potatoes, vegetables and fruit and to increase milk yields and livestock weight gains in 1982. And this is very important. If everyone fulfills the targets in his own area of production, this will be a reliable basis to ensure the successful implementation of the guidelines of the CPSU Central Committee May plenum.

In conclusion M.S. Gorbachev said:

Soviet people are working enthusiastically to implement the 26th CPSU Congress' historic decisions, which determined the program of our society's onward development along the path toward communism. The people are greeting the 60th anniversary of the USSR's formation under the sign of the triumph of the Leninist nationalities policy and the Soviet land's historic achievements. The efforts of the party and people are geared to further strengthening our motherland's economic and defense might and making increasingly full use of developed socialism's advantages in working people's interests. The successful resolution of the tasks of the 5-year plan and the Food Program will provide us with new opportunities for pursuing an active domestic and foreign policy -- a policy of peace and communist creation.

The report of F.I. Loshchenkov, first secretary of the CPSU obkom, and the speeches of A.V. Romanov, chairman of the Krasnaya Zarya kolkhoz, Yu.A. Skrebkov, director of the Shopsha sovkhoz, L.A. Zyablova, leader of an integral team of the Privolzhye kolkhoz, and others noted that the necessary preconditions have been created in the Yaroslavl area of the Non-Chernozem Zone for further increasing arable farming and livestock raising production. New stockraising premises have been commissioned and the stock of reclaimed land has increased. However, the standard and pace of agricultural development still do not meet the requirements put forward by the May plenum.

The plenum participants gave an assurance that the oblast's working people will make a worthy contribution to implementing the CPSU Central Committee May plenum decisions.

M.S. Gorbachev visited a number of kolkhozes and sovkhozes in Rostovskiy, Tutayevskiy and Yaroslavskiy rayons and familiarized himself with progress in the fulfillment of the plans and socialist pledges by the working people of these farms.

He visited the Avtodizel association and laid flowers at a monument in honor of the combat and labor feats of Yaroslav citizens in the Great Patriotic War.

Solomentsev in Ryazan

PM290955 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Jun 82 p 2

[TASS report on Ryazanskiy CPSU Obkom Plenum under the general heading "Equal to the New Tasks: Party Committees Discuss the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) Plenum Decisons"]

[Excerpts] Ryazan 15 Jun -- Turning the RSFSR's Non-Chernozem Zone into a zone of highly productive, intensive agricultural production is the task set by the party and government before the republic's workers. Major measures to further develop the productive forces of the countryside and of related sectors and profound social transformations are being implemented here. The CPSU Central Committee May (1982) plenum's decisions and the USSR Food Program approved by it are opening new vistas of the region's development.

This was noted at today's Ryazanskiy CPSU Obkom plenum. There was a discussion of the oblast party organization's tasks in the light of the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) plenum's decisions.

The plenum was addressed by M.S. Solomentsev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, who was warmly greeted by those present.

The CPSU Central Committee May (1982) plenum, he stressed, was a major political event in the life of our party and state and an important historical milestone in the Soviet people's struggle to further develop the country's economy and to improve Soviet people's prosperity.

The plenum's decisions and Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's propositions and conclusions are a major contribution to the development of the party's agrarian policy and the Marxist-Leninist theory of communist building. Never before has the party viewed the problems of agriculture and of related sectors of industry and of sociocultural and consumer construction in the countryside on such a large scale and in such a closely linked way.

From the RSFSR's example, the speaker noted, it is clear how great is the attention being paid by the Communist Party to further developing agriculture. Fixed productive capital and energy capacities have increased considerably on kolkhozes and sovkhozes, millions of hectares of reclaimed lands have been opened up and supplies of mineral fertilizers have increased. Quite a lot has been done to replenish farms with cadres, to train and improve the skills of experts, machine operators and workers in other mass trades. In the last two 5-year plans the number of experts with higher and secondary specialized education on the RSFSR's kolkhozes and sovkhozes has more than doubled.

This has yielded positive results. Despite the fact that there was extremely adverse weather in many RSFSR regions in the 10th 5-Year Plan period, gross average annual production increased by 37 percent in comparsion with the Seventh 5-Year Plan, procurements of all types of agricultural produce increased considerably.

The essence of the qualitative changes in the republic's agricultural development lies in the fact that it has firmly taken up the path of intensification.

While noting the positive improvements achieved in increasing the production and consumption of agricultural produce, the party does not overestimate them especially since there still exist certain difficulties in the supply to the population of some products. While taking this into account, the CPSU Central Committee May plenum outlined more rapid rates of development of agriculture and related industrial sectors and defined specific ways of reaching the set goals.

The kolkhozes and sovkhozes of the RSFSR's Non-Chernozem Zone are called upon to play an important part in implementing the Food Program. The party attaches great significance to the accelerated development of their economy which is also clearly visible from Ryazanskaya Oblast's example. Agriculture here is gradually being transferred to an industrial footing and is becoming an increasingly mechanized sector. However, the potential available is by no means being fully used and the pace of the agrarian sector's development has slowed in recent years.

The results of work have been affected, of course, by the weather which has not been kind to arable farmers, especially in the last 3 years. But it would be wrong to explain away the shortfall in agricultural development by the weather alone, since even under these conditions many kolkhozes and sovkhozes are working efficiently.

The insufficiently fast pace of agricultural development can be explained by the fact that many kolkhozes and sovkhozes are violating a scientifically validated arable farming system and are obtaining low returns from the use of improved lands, equipment and fertilizers. There are shortcomings in the organization of production.

The further accelerated and steady increase in grain production remains the key problem in agriculture. In the long-term, Ryazanskaya Oblast is to become a major grain producer in the RSFSR's Non-Chernozem Zone.

Arable farmers are faced with great tasks in increasing potato production. Ryazan's potato growers have quite a few glorious deeds to their credit. Unfortunately they have recently begun to forfeit their position. The cause lies in the slackening of attention paid to this very important sector's development. There is also much to be done to increase the production of vegetables, fruit and berries.

The USSR Food Program outlines basic measures to develop stockraising and to sharply increase the production of meat, milk and other products. Ryazanskaya Oblast is a major "milk producing shop" in the republic. It is also very significant in meat production. The oblast's party organization is doing a lot to develop stockraising. The production of this sector's output is increasing but the pace is inadequate and livestock productivity remains low.

Kolkhozes and sovkhozes have sufficiency of pedigree cattle and a corresponding production base. If cattle were provided with sufficient fodder it would be possible to increase milk and meat production considerably even with the existing herd. But for this, better use must be made of plowlands under fodder crops as well as of natural meadows and pastures.

The struggle to maintain and raise the quality of fodder is also an urgent task. Late harvesting and violations of the techniques of laying in and storing cured hay and silage are causing the loss of a considerable part of the cultivated harvest of fodder crops and the sharp deterioration of forage quality.

The population's personal subsidiary plots play an important role in increasing agricultural production. The country's Food Program envisages creating all the conditions to enable each family living in the countryside to have a farm plot and to keep livestock and poultry.

Local soviets and their executive organs are called upon to play a special role in this matter. They must approach each family, explain the importance of this work and, where necessary, give help in obtaining young animals and the allocation of hay-producing lands.

The speaker dwelt in detail on questions of accelerating scientific and technical progress and strengthening the material base of agriculture and all agro-industrial complex sectors.

It is the paramount duty of party, soviet and agricultural organs and all Communists of the oblast to exert the utmost effort to make more efficient use of equipment, capital investments and other physical resources and to adopt comprehensive measures which ensure the maximum return from every ruble of capital investments, every quintal of mineral fertilizers and every machine. A considerable increase in production must be obtained on this basis.

The industrial enterprises which supply agriculture with equipment and spares as well as mineral fertilizers, construction and other materials are called upon to make an important contribution to the implementation of the Food Program. Rural workers rightly expect that machine builders and chemical industry workers will increase the production of equipment and fertilizers more quickly and strive to ensure that their technical standard meets present-day requirements.

For agricultural and related sector workers it is a paramount obligation to resolutely combat losses throughout the food flowline -- from the arable field and livestock unit to the plant shop and counter -- and to organize the processing of agricultural produce to an excellent standard. The volumes of output already being produced make it possible to considerably raise the level of the population's supply of many types of food.

The successful implementation of the country's Food Program depends to a decisive extent on cadres, their skill, and knowledge and on the creation of stable labor collectives on every kolkhoz and sovkhoz.

The need for increasing attention to cadres is caused by the fact that under the influence of the present-day scientific and technical revoluion the character of rural production is changing literally before your eyes, is increasingly acquiring the features of industrial production and is using comprehensive modern equipment and manufacturing processes. It is very important to utilize experts in such a way that their knowledge and experience promote as much as possible the successful resolution of current and long-term questions of production development.

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers view measures on the social transformation of the countryside as a component of the Food Program.

The further transformation of rural centers of population into well-equipped settlements, the considerable expansion of housing, municipal and cultural-consumer construction, the improvement of medical and trade service and the building of roads will promote the consolidation of cadres and will increase the prosperity of rural workers and their production activity.

These questions are of special urgency for Ryazanskaya Oblast. Even though work has been done here in recent years to reequip the countryside, its pace is still inadequate. Volumes of self-built rural housing construction have fallen. This is leading to a fall in the rural population. Thus in the coming decade it is necessary to ensure that conditions are created to consolidate rural cadres and that housing, cultural-consumer and road construction are expanded considerably. It is also very important to comprehensively promote an increase in individual and cooperative rural construction.

Our work must be centered on present day tasks, M.S. Solomentsev stressed in conclusion, since the basis of the radical improvement of matters of food is being laid now in the country. It is very important even this year to strive to substantially increase arable farming and stock raising productivity, to ensure the fulfillment and overfulfillment the state plans for purchases of grain, meat, milk and other produce and to create a reliable basis for the more rapid development of agricultural production in subsequent years.

M.S. Solomentsev visited the Ryazselmash production association, the Iskra hog complex and the Rossiya kolkhoz.

Kuznetsov in Bashkiriya

PM290921 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jun 82 Morning Edition p 2

[TASS special correspondent report: "Abreast of New Tasks"]

[Excerpt] Ufa, 15 Jun -- Using the increased economic potential of Bashkiriya, the working people of the autonomous republic are pledging to make a substantial contribution this very year to the implementation of the USSR Food Program. This was stressed today at the Bashkirskiy party obkom plenum, which examined the results of the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) plenum, and the tasks arising from Comrade L.I. Brezhnev's report at that plenum.

V.V. Kuznetsov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, who was warmly greeted by those assembled, addressed the plenum. He conveyed to the plenum participants and all Communists and workers of Bashkiriya cordial greetings from Comrade L.I. Brezhnev and best wishes for success in the work to implement the decisions of the 26th party congress.

The CPSU Central Committee May plenum, the speaker went on to say, was a major sociopolitical event in the life of party and state. A central place in its work was occupied by the vivid and profoundly meaningful pithy report of Comrade L.I. Brezhnev. The Food Program, drawn up on the initiative of Leonid Ilich and with his direct participation, is a component of the party's economic strategy, aimed at the all-round social development of society and the improvement of the people's well-being. And it must produce its first results this very year.

And the working people of Bashkiriya are called on to make an important contribution to this affair of the whole people. The measures outlined by the party will yield their due return only if we learn to make far better use of machines and fertilizer and of everything which agriculture has and will have at its disposal. Here, there are still many instances of mismanagement, losses and wastefulness. PRAVDA wrote recently about shortcomings in the shipment, storage and use of fertilizers in your republic. In Bashkiriya some agricultural machinery is in disrepair, especially the equipment for harvesting and procuring fodder.

And it is especially important for everything that is grown to be received promptly from kolkhozes and sovkhozes, reliably preserved, processed and delivered to the consumer. After all, losses of agricultural produce are still too great.

The implementation of the Food Program depends to a large extent on the high-standard, prompt delivery of equipment, machinery, spare parts, mineral fertilizers, herbicides, fuels and lubricants and other resources. A considerable proportion of these is produced in Bashkiriya. Unfortunately, certain enterprises in the autonomous republic, including ones producing products for agriculture, do not always cope with the plan targets, allow losses to occur due to shoddy work and do not fulfill delivery pledges.

In the last 5-year plan period, Bashkiriya's construction workers proved that they can work efficiently. All the most important installations planned, a good part of which were for the countryside, were commissioned. It is necessary to exercise unwavering control over the construction of installations for agriculture and the entire agro-industrial complex, especially those which will enable the greatest increase in food products to be achieved in a short space of time. In outlining a broad construction program, the party appeals that construction sites of the agroindustrial complex be regarded as especially important, as shock projects. Here, there is great scope for initiative and businesslike enterprise. Internal reserves must be used to the utmost. And the incomplete assimilation of funds for housing and sociocultural construction is evidence that reserves are far from being exploited fully.

A major issue is citizen's individual subsidiary plots and truck garden cooperatives. It is necessary to continue to give them systematic help and also to make fuller use of the potential of enterprises' subsidiary farms.

A large proportion of the work on implementing the Food Program is the responsibility of the soviets. Their tasks were clearly defined in Leonid Ilich Brezhnev's speech on 31 May at the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium session. The CPSU Central Committee and Comrade L.I. Brezhnev display constant concern for the organs of people's power. In recent years the party has devised and implemented a whole series of major measures to galvanize the activity of the soviets. The legislation concerning the representative organs of power and the extension of their powers has been substantially updated. Soviets everywhere have intensified their attention toward economic construction and the key problems of the comprehensive socioeconomic development of their territory.

Good experience along these lines has been accumulated in Bashkiriya too. And it must be disseminated to the utmost to accelerate the implementation of the Food Program.

The soviets are now granted extensive rights in coordinating and monitoring the work of all enterprises and organizations located on their territory and they are using these rights increasingly actively. The increase in the soviets' coordinating powers enables appreciable results to be achieved both in the sphere of the economy and in sociocultural services for the people, allows the best possible combination of the sectorial and territorial principle in management and in the development of production and of the social infrastructure, and makes possible the wise use of material, financial and labor resources.

A fundamentally new element in improving the management of agriculture and of the sectors connected with it is the decision to form rayon, oblast and -- in the case of autonomous republics -- republican agroindustrial associations.

The chief managerial link will be the councils of the agroindustrial associations. They will be created at sessions of the rayon, oblast and kray soviets and the autonomous republics' supreme soviets. The councils of the agroindustrial associations must link together by common responsibility and common integrity the kolkhozes, sovkhozes and all organizations which serve them. Now the chief criterion for assessing work will be end results and not just for kolkhozes and sovkhozes but also for all organizations and enterprises serving agriculture.

The soviets, under the guidance of the party organs, must direct and monitor daily the work of the agroindustrial associations. It must be said that experience of such work has already been accumulated among certain soviets.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium recently examined the experience of the formation and functioning of agroindustrial associations in the Abashskiy Rayon of the Georgian SSR and the Talsinskiy Rayon of the Latvian SSR. The results of their activity have proved positive. Over the course of several years these rayons have achieved higher indicators in the production of all types of produce than on average throughout the republics.

Special attention must be paid to forming really full-fledged and democratic management organs. And here the rayon link must be placed at the forefront. For it is precisely in the rayon that the ability of the new organs will be tested -- that is, their ability to influence the most important thing -- the production of plant-growing and stockraising produce on kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

Party organs and soviets must skillfully coordinate and pool the efforts of all subdivisions taking part in implementing the Food Program, increase their vested interest in achieving high end results and provide comprehensive and concrete help for the new management organs taking account of local conditions, without tolerating excessive bureaucracy and pretty tutelage, over kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

In the union republics, commissions of the presidiums of the councils of ministers or other bodies involved with questions of the agroindustrial complex are being set up. A USSR Council of Ministers Presidium Commission on Questions of the Agroindustrial Complex has already been created.

Just now the election campaign for local soviets and rayon and city courts is drawing to a close. About 2.3 million deputies will be elected. This is a huge force and the party organs must see to it that the newly elected Soviets immediately and without delay involve themselves in the work to fulfill the tasks arising from the decisions of the May plenum.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium in its resolution of 31 May recommended that questions of the development of the agroindustrial complex and its sectors and of the fulfillment of measures to implement the Food Program, improve the activeness of labor collectives and improve the forms and methods of educational work among the population, be regularly discussed at soviets' sessions and sessions of their ispolkoms and standing commissions.

The work of our cadres and of all working people to further boost agriculture is being mounted at a time when preparation is under way in the country for the 60th anniversary of the formation of the USSR. Socialist competition is gathering momentum. The pledges to fulfill the Food Program must find a place worthy of them in this patriotic movement.

The guarantee of success in fulfilling the tasks set by the plenum is provided by the initiative, discipline and responsibility of our cadres and above all of association, enterprise and farm leaders. The implementation of the Food Program is the business of all working people, but, as always, the rural Communists must be in the front line of the struggle to implement it.

The plenum stressed the important role of the kolkhoz and sovkhoz primary party organizations. The tasks of communists working in all organizations and enterprises of the agroindustrial complex are no less crucial. It is important for party organizations to focus their efforts on the chief point, which is work with people and the mobilization of their knowledge and experience, energy and initiative to fulfill the party's plans. The matter depends on the party raykoms and, under their leadership, all soviet and public organizations making maximum use of the opportunities which are being created for an accelerated growth in agricultural production and for the improvement of labor and living conditions in the countryside.

For 37 years the Soviet people have been enjoying the blessings of peace. Each step along this path is connected with the great and multifaceted activity being effected for the good of peace by the leadership of our party and country and by Comrade L.I. Brezhnev — that outstanding statesman and politician of our time and tireless fighter for peace. And today, V.V. Kuznetsov stressed in conclusion, we see again how the economic and social line of our party, which found expression in the decisions of the May plenum, and its foreign policy strategy -- are organically bound together. They have a single goal -- the steady improvement of the people's living standard, the guaranteeing of the country's peace and security and the building of a communist future.

V.V. Kuznetsov had a talk in the Bashkirskaya ASSR CPSU Obkom and Supreme Soviet Presidium and visited the Ufa motor building production association and the Yumatovskiy cattle fattening complex.

ROMANOV PRESENTS ORDER TO ENGINEERING INSTITUTE

LD251654 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 25 Jun 82

[Text] Today, Comrade Romanov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Leningradskiy Obkom, pinned the Order of Lenin to the banner of the Leningrad Engineering Institute. For over half a century now the VUZ has been training engineering cadres, designers, technicians and managers for industry. Graduates of the institute not only possess excellent professional knowledge but also high qualities essential for management in manufacturing.

SHEVARDNADZE PRESENTS RED BANNER AWARD

LD282114 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1950 GMT 28 Jun 82

[Text] The Abastumani Astrophysics Observatory of the Georgian Academy of Sciences is marking its 50th anniversary. For its contribution to the development of astronomy, it was awarded the Order of the Labor Red Banner. The high homeland award was presented to the observatory collective by Comrade Shevardnadze, candidate member of Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee.

TV REPORTS ON ECONOMIC EDUCATION DECISION

LD262256 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 26 Jun 82

[From the Vremya newscast]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and All-Union Komsomol adopted a decision on the further improvement of economic education and training working people. It notes that the system of economic education set up after the 24th party congress occupied an important place in ideological education and economic work. At the same time, the quality and results of economic instruction of the working people still does not measure up to the strategic orientation of the 26th CPSU Congress toward completing the transition of the economy onto the path of intensive development and making it truly economic.

The decision approves the following structure of economic education: schools of communist labor; schools of concrete [konkretniy] economy; and economic seminars. The CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers AUCCTU and All-Union Komsomol expressed confidence that the party, soviet, trade union and Komsomol organizations, and the economic organs, will ensure the further improvement of economic education, directing the creative energies of Soviet people and their great strength of knowledge toward implementing the plans for communist construction.

FALIN VIEWS AMERICA'S 'TURN FROM DETENTE'

WA190420 Moscow ZNAMYA in Russian No 4, Apr 82 pp 190-202

[Article by V. Falin: "Causes and Consequences"]

[Text] People in the West and in the East incessantly ask the questions: Why are international relations once again feverish? Why are somewhat stronger words and tougher expressions again being picked out from the vast political lexicon? How is it that the positive capital of the cooperation of the 1970's has been frozen in a number of NATO countries or is being cast to the winds? Why contrary to commonsense and in spite of objective realities, is confrontation and not good-neighborliness being taken as a reference point in policy? After all, something must have happened for the R. Reagan administration to have announced a fundamental revision of the course of U.S. foreign policy. What, then, is it all about?

Events have their own intrinsic logic. And sooner or later it reveals itself, whatever the mystery surrounding it.

There was an inspired expression of V.G. Belinskiy's: The word is a thought or an empty phrase. But there are words that contain something more than merely a thought. These are concept-words, principle-words personifying people's world outlook and illuminating the programs of social groups and parties.

Among these, a particular place is occupied by the word "detente." Previously commonplace and unobtrusive, it has moved, in combination with "tension," to the center of heated arguments. It is this that for some time has been the yardstick of states' intentions and practical deeds and the touchstone against which political declarations are tested.

And there are more than serious grounds for this: Mankind is living in an era that in material and social parameters is qualitatively different from everything that has gone before. The peoples are solving the equation without unknown quantities: In what is most important -- the question of to be or not to be -- it is clear in advance what lies ahead and what will happen if governments neglect their responsibility and plunge the world into a thermonuclear catastrophe. It is also obvious in advance that our planet will not long survive a selfish, plundering attitude toward its natural wealth. It will not endure the additional deep wounds that continue to be inflicted on the land and the oceans and the atmosphere and ionosphere.

Let us ponder the following fact. More mineral raw material and energy was expended in seven decades of the 20th century than in all previous human history. The planet's present inhabitants are consuming more resources in their lifetime than their predecessors consumed in 10 million years. And, to be accurate, it has to be said that wars and preparations for war alone have swallowed up in the current century virtually more material wealth than man has expended since his appearance on earth.

What is this called? Who has given those living today the right to squander the resources that also belong to posterity and that constitute the material foundation of the civilization that did not begin today and that must not end today? Why is the basis of the actions of many governments, political parties and economic groups still the philosophy of after us, the deluge? Are rapacity, thoughtless egoism and a reluctance to ask the questions, why do you put yourself higher than the rest, place your interest higher even than that of your own children and grandchildren and destroy, poison and deface your environment -- are these the insurmountable, innate traits of man?

According to experts' calculations, by the year 2000, for every two persons living on earth in 1975 there will be three. On the average, there will remain instead of the two-fifths of a hectare of cultivated land per capita only one-fourth of a hectare. The difficulties of water supply will be heightened. Oil deposits will have been half

worked out. Some 40 percent of the forests that existed at the end of the 1970's in the developing countries will have been felled. According to forecasts, 15-20 percent -- roughly 500,000 -- of all species of animals and plants on earth will have disappeared in the next two decades.

There is no need to continue this gloomy catalog to show the scale and complexity of the approaching problems which have been linked by a common denominator: Not one of them is susceptible to a solution by force of arms and through the confrontation of states. The interests of the peoples demand not a separation of efforts but their fusion and not a confrontation of attitudes but mutual understanding. However difficult and exacting this may be and however much patience and assiduity in negotiations it may take, intelligent and humane principles must gain the ascendancy over instincts and reflexes acquired in an atmosphere of constant fear.

The realities of existence insistently dictate the need for cooperation between peoples. The cybernetic age is not only a constantly growing complexity of machinery and instruments. It is primarily the growing complexity of broad social phenomena and the increasingly close mutual penetration and interweaving of interests. The international community numbers almost 160 states with singularities in socioeconomic systems and forms of government and in geographical, climatic and other factors inherent in each of them. Each claims a fitting place under the sun, and there is not one that is prepared to content itself with being an historical outcast.

World economic relations are being shaped anew. Common standards affecting the environment and the oceans and its resources are coming into being. A world science is taking shape, even if 90-95 percent of all scientific research and experimental design is being performed in the industrially developed countries. Man is putting technology at his service ever more intensively, which in itself presupposes the preservation of peace as an indispensable condition of its safe use. Nuclear reactors -- industrial and scientific, many types of chemical production and certain methods of extracting minerals are only individual examples of the extent to which peace and progress and peace and prosperity have already coalesced.

Science, technology and industry in the process of development are continuously reinterpreting and renewing the arsenal of our ideas and their material reflection. Take the well-known West German Siemens concern. Half of its turnover is currently accounted for by products that did not figure in its production 5 years ago.

And how do matters stand with respect to social consciousness and politics? Are they keeping pace with the rapid changes? In these areas, the answers to the questions that arise are born to meet each occasion in the struggle of diametric contradictions and in the antagonism of what is outmoded and what is to come. Here are just a few of the facts that have arisen on the thorny path toward the recognition of undisputed, objective truths.

The outcome of World War II was logical. Right conquered. The aggressor was halted and smashed. The aggression, which claimed 55 million lives, was condemned as a crime against humanity, and its chief culprits were severely punished for the evil they had perpetrated and for the edification of all future aggressors.

But when the peoples listened to the joint statements and agreements of the powers of the anti-Hitler coalition and the verdict of the Nuremberg Tribunal with faith and hope for a bright future, they were unaware of much that was being done backstage in Washington. World War II had hardly died away, the ashes of fire-ravaged remains had hardly cooled and the print of solemn undertakings to establish eternal peace in this world had hardly faded before work was seething in American headquarters on the compilation of detailed plans for an attack on the Soviet Union with nuclear weapons. Yesterday's ally in the anti-Hitler coalition and the struggle against militarist Japan had become an impediment to Washington's hegemonist aspirations. This impediment had to be removed by any means -- such was the task formulated.

"Atomic diplomacy," "brinksmanship" and a concentrated arms race were set in motion. Military blocs were stitched together, hundreds of military bases were deployed around the Soviet Union and military conflicts were instigated. Seas of blood were spilled, but Washington still failed to achieve peace American-style. Imperialism was incapable of overwhelming history.

Having gambled on the exhaustion, economic and psychological, and the wearing out of others with the "cold war" and the threat of it being converted willy-nilly into a hot war, the United States had itself by the end of the 1960's come to perceive the burdens for itself of such a course and its hopelessness. The former strategic invulnerability of the United States, which had enabled it to interfere with impunity to a certain extent in the affairs of other states and thereby encourage imperial adventurism and ambitions, had sunk into oblivion. It transpired that the United States was not omnipotent and that it had to learn to agree to compromises and concessions, be more attentive to the opinions and rights of others and develop a taste for restraint and flexibility. The striking discovery that America was not necessarily the center of the universe dawned on Washington politicians, frankly, somewhat late. But it arrived, nonetheless. Almost as inevitably as Galileo was rehabilitated three and a half centuries after his condemnation by the Inquisition for not recognizing the earth as the center of the universe.

May 1972 was, seemingly, a turning point in international development. The top-level meeting in Moscow "opened," as L.I. Brezhnev emphasized, "the way to a turnabout in Soviet-American relations from confrontation to detente, normalization and mutually profitable cooperation." The "Principles of Relations Between the USSR and the United States" were authenticated by the signatures of the leaders of both states. This historic document says that the sides "will proceed from the common conviction that in the nuclear age there exists no other basis for relations between them than peaceful coexistence." The USSR and the United States undertook to settle disagreements by peaceful means, avoid military confrontations and display restraint in their mutual relations. The leaders of the two powers proclaimed that "the differences in the ideology and social systems of the USSR and the United States are not an obstacle to the development between them of normal relations based on the principles of sovereignty, equality, noninterference in each other's internal affairs and mutual advantage." The principle of the sides' equal security as predominant in the solution of questions about limiting the arms race and lowering the levels of military confrontation was adopted.

A number of new agreements was reached in June 1973 on various aspects of Soviet-American cooperation. Noteworthy among these was the agreement on preventing nuclear war and the basic principles of talks to further limit strategic offensive arms. The purpose of the agreements was to create conditions under which the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war anywhere in the world would be reduced and ultimately eliminated. The goal of the basic principles was to determine the parameters of a future treaty that, logically continuing and developing the 1972 interim agreement on certain measures in the sphere of limiting strategic offensive arms (SALT I), would put a solid, strong foundation under the entire joint work of the USSR and the United States in the interest of stabilizing the military-political situation in the world and help translate the will to reconciliation expressed by both sides into the language of concrete deeds.

It was perhaps precisely the fundamental importance of the changes that had been revealed that was the true cause of the sharp stimulation as of mid-1973 of those forces in the United States, in the West as a whole and in China that rejected detente as a fundamentally defective philosophy and put up the strongest possible resistance to it at all stages. Whereas in the first stage they hoped that the recuperation process would itself lead to an impasse and that on encountering difficulties the energy of the states aimed at a reorganization of international relations would rapidly wane, they now decided to act, and act drastically.

Despite all the differences, the situation of 1945 and 1963 was repeated. Immediately after the war, the most aggressive grouping in the U.S. leadership betrayed the cause

of the anti-Hitler coalition, which had been paid for with the lives of tens of millions of people. The Yalta and Potsdam agreements were derailed, and the Americans ceased to implement them or attempted to give them an interpretation that had nothing in common with their meaning and purpose. The very idea of cooperation with the communist Soviet Union was declared heretical, and F. Roosevelt and other U.S. leaders of the World War II period were declared virtual traitors.

The legend of F. Roosevelt's violent death probably proved to be tenacious because it was not simply a man's life that had been cut short. The policy thread had been cut. The figures who replaced him did everything to discredit and destroy the political credo that the president had bequeathed his country. As if foreseeing the subsequent course of events, F. Roosevelt warned in his final address to the U.S. Congress that the United States must abide by the commitments it had assumed in the decisions of the anti-Hitler coalition or bear the responsibility for a new world catastrophe. H. Truman and his administration did not heed the call. They were in the grip of a dream of world domination or, as they put it at that time, "American world leadership." Endeavoring to lend weight to this claim, the United States ventured to use nuclear weapons against Japan. The British physicist P. Blackett fairly observed that "the use of the atomic bomb was not so much the culminating act of World War II as the first big operation in the 'diplomatic cold war' against the USSR."

The secret of President J. Kennedy's murder is perhaps guarded so carefully because the crime was of a purely political nature, whoever perpetrated it. There are many knowledgeable people in the United States who believe that J. Kennedy signed his own death warrant when in June 1963 he expressed the "seditious" idea at a Washington university about the need to rethink the U.S. role in the modern world and draw from realities the necessary conclusions for the country's policy.

The prospect of a renunciation of a straightforward hostile course with respect to the USSR, a halt to American aggression in Vietnam, some kind of normalization of relations with Cuba -- no, all these were manifestly not inscribed in the then political landscape of the United States. The conservative elite preferred to move in the vicious circle of bellicose anticommunism and American exclusiveness.

And R. Nixon's political demise? Was Watergate its true cause? How many Watergates -- big and small -- America has known in the 20th century, but the culprits have come out of all of them comparatively dry. Nixon's assistants claim that the president fell into a trap cleverly set by the CIA. Be this as it may, it will hardly become known soon. There is, however, no doubt that Nixon's departure -- and departure amid scandal -- was necessary for those powerful U.S. circles that disliked not the methods but the essence of his policy, primarily the direction of his foreign policy.

In recognizing the principles of peaceful coexistence and agreeing to restrain the arms race in the most dangerous strategic nuclear sphere, Nixon had encroached on the sanctum sanctorum of the "American way of life" -- the cult of strength. He made his fall more certain by the decision to put a stop to the adventure against the peoples of Indochina, thereby cementing for the United States a grave military defeat, which, naturally, in no way raised America's prestige in the eyes of those who literally and figuratively exist by the grace of Washington.

Specialists will have to labor mightily to make clear what has changed, after Nixon, in the creation of guarantees against a repetition of new Watergates. On the other hand, it is visible to the naked eye what changed in U.S. policy with the change in the White House. G. Ford, whom R. Nixon chose as his successor, undertook the dismantling of detente as a political principle and practical policy. Endeavoring to please reactionaries, he erased detente from his election slogans in the 1976 campaign. Having said "A," Ford was forced to say "B" as well: The almost completed SALT II Treaty was sacrificed to the military-industrial complex and the anticommunist prejudices of the powers that be.

G. Ford lost the election. His rival promised the public a reduction in military spending, social benefits and attention to the needs of the needy, the downtrodden and the unemployed. That was a deliberate lie for, as J. Carter cynically declared later, even before he took office he had been preoccupied with the problem not of disarmament but of spurring the arms race and not of cutting the military budget but of inflating it in a concentrated manner.

"Human rights," in connection with which so many have been crucified, was merely the seasoning for a piquant dish. While graitfying the man in the street's ears with tales of "good will," Carter gave birth to one militarist program after another. Having promised to reduce the country's military spending, in the very first year of his term in office he began jacking up appropriations for military preparations and by the end of his term in the White House had raised them to $180 billion (compared with $98.3 billion in 1976).

Carter officially stimulated the demand for restoration of the United States' "leading role" in the world. He and his cabinet clothed in the form of new doctrines, directives and instructions the United States' old imperial pretensions.

Can we wonder in the light of the adduced facts that Carter had no wish to include in the joint statement on the results of the meeting with L.I. Brezhnev in June 1979 in Vienna confirmation of the principle of peaceful coexistence? Nor was the farce conducted by his administration with respect to ratification of the SALT II Treaty a surprise. After all, literally the day following the signing of the treaty the President and members of his cabinet were conducting business in the direction of piling up insurmountable obstacles to its approval by the Senate.

We should not indulge in oversimplications, which merely impede establishment of the truth, and portray the situation as though the American monopolies and the military-industrial complex have become autocrats in the country and that U.S. presidents are at their beck and call. Presidents can influence the domestic and foreign policy of the United States, and quite impressively at that. There is evidence of this, convincing evidence. But something else is no less correct. The guarantee of the monopolies' omnipotence lies in the multistage filter through which candidates for important positions of state pass, the financial levers that drive the election campaigns, the undivided sway in the sphere of information and the broadest opportunities for manipulating public opinion. If one does not get the job done, another guarantee is activated, and extreme means are always laid by for an emergency. And when it comes to a conflict between a president and monopoly capital and between the executive and the military-industrial complex, the losing side is, as a rule, the president, provided he is not rescued temporarily by internecine struggle within the financial and industrial oligarchy itself.

With all these reservations, it may be said with complete justification that the sanctimonious J. Carter was assiduous in his gratitude to the circles that had dragged him from obscurity to the highest office in the United States. Carter's hands had to put an end to the policy of detente. With his help, detente had to be surrounded with a howl of mistrust, disillusionment and pessimism. It was necessary to kindle in the man in the street instincts for reliance more on muscle than on brain.

Rarely has a president after a 4-year term of office faced the judgment of the electorate with such scant baggage as Carter. Not a single fulfilled promise. Under him, everything became worse than before. But in politics, as in the stock market, a gamble on a decline in the value of some shares can raise the quotation on others. It is instilled in the American that his life has been thrown into a sorry state because of an absurd president and his incompetent advisers. But not only and not so much because of them. The main cause of the troubles is declared to be -- how could it be otherwise -- the Soviet Union and its friends and those who are "doing in" the United States, which has become, through the fault of Carter and those like him, "defenseless" in the face of the challenge being thrown at it. Subjected to the most varied methods from the arsenal of psychological

warfare, public opinion is led to the conclusion that all evil in the world comes from communism, that the Soviet Union's conversion to the American faith should be a condition of the prevention of war and that the demand that everyone imitate the United States and accept its moral, political and economic leadership is designed to supersede and take the place of the principle of equality and all that constitutes the essence of peaceful coexistence.

When the logic of life and the interests of a ruling class are in contradiction, a crisis of policy or even of the system begins. Initially, this is in the majority of cases an internal crisis. But it is natural for people to explain their own shortcomings and blunders by the dirty tricks and machinations of others and to seek a way out of internal disorder in outside conflicts. Frequently, too frequently, perhaps, politicians consign to oblivion the fact that in relations between states there has long been no place for instinctiveness, willfulness and bad temper. An oversimplified vision of the world belongs entirely to the past, and an unduly high opinion of oneself leads to self-deception or, what is worse, brings about processes whose outcome is the reverse of that calculated.

Time will show what shoots will be produced by the seeds sown by Carter and his team. They did everything in their power to kindle war hysteria, undermine the foundations of peaceful coexistence and estrange the peoples. What has been the result?

Let us cite the American bourgeois scholar R. Barnet. He stated in his book "True Security," published in 1981: "Since 1945, the United States has spent almost $3 trillion on ensuring national security. Our security is now less reliable than before. Our military spending in this perid has exceeded the aggregate military spending of all other countries. We are the sole power with hundreds of military bases far from America's shores. We possess destructive power greater than that of any other power. But we are manifestly incapable of transforming this monstrous arsenal of lethal weapons into political strength."

To this could be added: The higher the absolute level of military preparations, the lower the comparative level of security. Such is virtually the mathematical formula of the political reality of our day, when an attempt on another's security has become the equivalent of a renunciation of one's own security.

Public opinion polls indicate that almost two-thirds of all Americans recognize the need for a search for a more solid foundation of security than new mountains of weapons and advocate continuation of the SALT talks with the USSR. Under the conditions of the unprecedented anticommunist, anti-Soviet, nationalistic and chauvinist propaganda to which the U.S. public has been subjected for 3-4 years now, the poll data constitute phenomena that virtually instill a certain hope.

Ronald Reagan was given an opportunity to begin his activity as president on the fruitful wave of political dialogue with the USSR and other countries in the interests of consolidating peace. The constructive initiatives put forward by the 26th CPSU Congress directly invited him to clarify at the negotiating table all problems in dispute and compare not gropingly and blindly but with the cards face up the opinions, assessments and standpoints of the sides on disturbing aspects of present-day development.

The international public wanted to believe that R. Reagan, presidential candidate, and R. Reagan, the head of an administration, would be able to make the distinction between them, just as the artificially agitated electoral passions of America are distinguished from the America engaged in pressing day-to-day concerns. The experience of life and commonsense suggest that no one, including the United States, can gain and does not gain from a multiplication of dangers -- these inevitable satellites of the arms race, saber-rattling and other power plays in policy.

But what has been observed in the last 18 months in Washington shows for the umpteenth time that from general objective premises, governments may draw different and sometimes

opposite conclusions. "There is currently no more important task internationally for our party, our people and all peoples of the planet," L.I. Brezhnev emphasized in the CPSU Central Committee Report to the 26th congress, "than the defense of peace." Representatives of the new U.S. administration assert, on the contrary, that "there are things that are more important than peace." Accordingly, they are setting their sights not on an easing of international tension and not on the encouragement of positive processes in the sphere of politics, economics and military matters but on imposing on the world community decisions that the American ruling class deems expedient and profitable for itself. An imposition irrespective of the consequences.

Washington pretentiously divides people, states and phenomena into "clean" and "unclean." In accordance with indications known only to the United States, they determine which people are "ripe" for democracy and freedom and which still have to undergo a course of instruction under the sway of American proteges. The President and his entourage are flaunting their unwillingness to have consideration for anyone. They find it unnecessary and harmful even to conceal the cupidity of the American view. The following sentence belongs to Reagan: "I suppose that the strongest reaction to what I say will be evoked by my assertion that we should perhaps cease being worried about whether all of the rest of the world likes us and resolve that we will force ourselves to be respected, as before."

Informed observers note that the Soviet Peace Program for the 1980's was greeted in the White House with irritation and that the first impulse was to respond with a categorical "no" to the invitation to dialogue. It was only under the pressure of allies, neutrals and the developing states, and with regard for the reaction inside the United States, that Reagan and Haig considered that it would be better to maneuver and, citing the difficulties of the current international situation, request a time out. As they said initially, the United States would need 6-9 months to sort out the inheritance of the predecessors and formulate its own approach.

If only this were what it was a question of! -- the new administration requiring a pause solely to determine how matters stood with respect to decisions benefiting the world community of states as a whole. On the other hand, judging by the facts, it was perfecting clear in advance about its plans and actions, which would lead to contortions in man's development that are dangerous and difficult to remove.

There has not been a single proposal or a single initiative from which it would even unintentionally follow that the United States is inclined to share with others in good-neighborly fashion the common skies above our planet and observe the rules of community living. And, as AP reported, in the first 2 months alone, the R. Reagan administration studied approximately 450 military programs. Many of these make the malestrom of the arms race even more ominous.

Paramount attention is being given to the creation of qualitatively new weapons systems. The development of laser, space and other "exotic" types of arms is being stepped up. Course is being set toward the production of a new generation of chemical and the stockpiling of bacteriological weapons. A decision has been taken on the full-scale manufacture of the neutron bomb, and this decision was timed, moreover, to coincide with the anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and was evidently intended to symbolize U.S. consistency in reliance on nuclear weapons. Particular emphasis is being put on the designing of first-strike weapons.

Supplementary budget resources for the 1980-1981 fiscal year ($6.8 billion) were requested for these programs, and military spending in 1982 has been set at $217.9 billion. In 1983, appropriations are to increase to $255-260 billion and to constitute altogether in the next 5-year period approximately $2.3 trillion.

One wonders why, if the administration has not defined its approach to world problems, it is embarking on acts that, at a minimum, will only complicate their solution. Or is it more justified to suppose that a choice has been made and that antidetente has already

become the pivot of the new U.S. policy? Representatives of the present administration proclaim that a new era is beginning with Reagan. What is its essence? That under really totally different conditions, attempts are being made to repeat no, not the forgotten but the thousand-times accursed past, which has been rejected by the peoples.

Faced with the incontrovertible facts, high figures of the U.S. administration have even been forced to acknowledge that no extraordinary situation exists. In an interview with the French television station Antenne 2, Secretary of State Alexander Haig observed on 23 February 1981 that there is an approximate balance of strategic forces of the USSR and the United States. "As I believe in principle," he declared, "many experts agree that we are at a point of comparative balance and equivalence." A rough equivalence of forces is maintained between the Warsaw Pact organization and NATO. Addressing a national security conference in mid-June 1981, even Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, who is the most off-hand in his language, spoke of the balance of the nuclear forces of the United States and the Soviet Union.

For this reason, propositions concerning the USSR's "intentions," the "increased aggressiveness" of Soviet policy and certain "dangerous trends" are being put into circulation. In the said interview, Haig expressed "serious concern" that "in a very short time, in the middle of this decade possibly, this equivalence will change rapidly in the direction of the superiority of the Russians."

Elementary alogism. If a trend is emerging, it is the simplest thing to put a stop to it by concluding an appropriate treaty that would help regulate the course of events. As a matter of fact, it was on this that the SALT II Treaty, which placed quantitative and qualitative ceilings on competition in the strategic sphere, was constructed. The same purpose is served by the Soviet proposal concerning a moratorium on intermediate-range missiles in Europe. In rejecting such solutions, the American leaders are not seeking to maintain balance. They are motivated not by "dangerous trends" in the actions of others. And Weinberger is perfectly candid here.

"U.S. military strategy for the 1980's," the secretary declared at the above-mentioned conference, "should begin with a realization of our national interests and a recognition of the existing threat and be geared to curbing this threat. In order to achieve this most important goal:

"We will put a stop to coercion in respect of the United States and its allies and friends.

"We will be in a position to protect the interests of the United States and its citizens abroad.

"We will maintain access to critically important resources throughout the world, including oil.

"We will counteract the expansion of the Russians' influence geographically and their military presence worldwide, particularly where this presence constitutes a threat to our geostrategic positions.

"We will encourage long-term political and military changes in the Soviet empire contributing to the development of a more peaceful and reliable world order."

Exhaustive Caspar, it could not have been better put. The United States intends, according to Weinberger, "to protect" by any means everywhere on the planet "the interests of the United States and its citizens" and "counteract the expansion of the influence" of the USSR, not stopping short at interference in other countries' internal affairs. An example of this is the United States' cynical and flagrant attempts to dictate to Poland, impose American prescriptions for the solution of entirely internal Polish affairs and complicate Poland's relations with its friends and allies. Earlier, such a policy led to wars and for this reason was termed aggressive and adventurist. It should be categorized in just the same way today, too.

U.S. military plans do not derive from Soviet actions or doctrines, on which Atlantic ideologists pin the collective label "military threat." We would recall that the capitalist world began making a noise about the Soviet threat immediately after the October Revolution. Interventions against the Soviet republics, including the armed intervention of the United States, were justified by the need to smother this threat in the cradle. Even on the eve of Hitler Germany's attack on the Soviet Union, Western propagandists were hastily writing that our country was arming itself "over and above its defensive requirements." And even after the attack, certain American, British and other figures occupying ministerial and Senate positions were calculating whether the USSR could be weakened via the Nazis and whether it could be knocked out of the saddle.

After World War II, the "Soviet threat" motifs were sung in all tunes and registers. And the music was commissioned and its performance paid for by that same motley company of bellicose imperialist forces for which time stopped at the moment when capital momentarily felt itself master of the planet.

It is not a question of military balance. The Soviet Union has not surpassed the United States in a military respect. It has not set and does not set itself such a goal. The essence lies elsewhere -- in Washington's denial of the principle of equality as a cardinal proposition of international relations on which alone it is possible to base peaceful order. A society that does not know real equality within and that perceives the demand for social justice as a challenge and mortal threat to its way of life has not matured to the point of understanding the changes that have occurred in the world in recent decades. The inertia of the past is driving down all shoots of realism and an extreme retrograde outlook is prompting the world to be seen in one antiquated dimension. In other words, the sicknesses of America as a system built on violence, the triumph of the strong over the weak and the elite's disregard for the interests of the exploited majority are being served up as its merits, which other states and peoples are supposed to idolize.

The allegiance to principle of the imperialist West can be measured. It is still in some way valued in sunny, calm weather. It is cast aside every time it comes into conflict with the narrowly understood interests of the ruling minority. But principles that are celebrated on big holidays are not principles. They are decorations under the cover of which it is convenient to perpetuate tyranny.

And the explanation that the United States "sees the situation thus," "understands it thus" and "evaluates Soviet intentions thus" explains nothing. This is an excuse, evasion or political color-blindness. Innate or acquired, it is not important. The main thing is that it prevents white being seen as white and black as black. In everyday life people suffering from color-blindness are prohibited from operating automobiles, airplanes and ships: the color mixup is too dangerous for others in the vicinity. Yet political color-blindness is considered a merit in imperialist circles. Figures for whom the color red mainly dims the gaze and dulls the mind are entrusted with the helms of ships of state and are permitted to play with the fate of the peoples.

The "dangerous trends" about which A. Haig spoke need to be sought not in the sphere of intentions ascribed to the Soviet Union but in the actions of the United States and some of its allies and fellow travelers and in Washington's unrestrained desire to convert land, sea, air and space into an arena of uncompromising confrontation and an arena where, as former President R. Nixon recently pronounced, there can be no no man's land. The "dangerous trends" are contained in U.S. claims to an "exclusive position" of all-permissiveness [vsedozvolennost'] and the role of supreme arbiter in worldly and spiritual matters.

The United States is rearming. For what? In order, as Pentagon leaders reason, to acquire the capability of waging war on any scale and of any intensity in any part of the world and of waging several wars at once. There will be no more Vietnams, Washington declares. No, this is not a promise to refrain, remembering the outcome of the aggression in the Indochina region, from new adventures. The resolve is proclaimed, a war having been started, to bring it to a conclusion and "not allow victory to slip away."

In modifying the military superiority concept and substituting the "changed correlation of forces" (not to the benefit of the Americans) concept for the concept of balance, the new U.S. leaders are talking about the need to create a "reserve of strength" of the country's military might. Of what order: twofold, threefold, fivefold? The biggest. So that the United States is reckoned with.

A false target engenders a false policy. As serious experts believe, no country is now capable of achieving overwhelming superiority. And the United States is no exception. It is also incapable of creating a situation wherein it could do anything it thinks fit with impunity.

However, the specifics of the modern world are such that it is increasingly difficult to balance the erroneous policy of one or several members of the international community with the constructive actions of the others. Consequently, despite the completely doomed nature of the course aimed at military superiority being set by the strongest power of the imperialist system, we cannot pretend and persuade ourselves and others that nothing serious is happening. Life, of course, is always the best teacher. But something else is also true: We must not count on the capacity of people and societies for self-instruction. It is easier to teach and make receptive to human speech some machine than it is a politician, who is deaf in one ear, and sometimes both, and who keeps at the ready two and sometimes more yardsticks -- one for himself, another for allies and yet another for the rest, according to the degree of sympathies and antipathies.

It may be objected that it has been this way for thousands of years. It has. But if states do not now renounce double standards, do not cease to measure identical phenomena by a different scale and continue to interpret good-neighborliness as someone's, but by no means one's own, obligation to wipe away an insult, pinprick and discomfort and as the submissiveness and servility of the weaker before the stronger, mankind is almost lost. For a dispute now is not waged with swords and dueling pistols.

The peoples will probably not be able to count on politicians ultimately acquiring wisdom and responsibility that outweigh the gamblers' excitement. And if it is not acquired? It is necessary to make the very thought of war impossible and to knock the ground from under militarist thinking. Only then will there be the assurance that the weapons will not begin to speak and that governments will be subordinated to common rules of community living, however much some people might wish to fence off for themselves convenient exceptions.

Whence also another conclusion -- if, on the other hand, visual aids removing the taste for and gravitation toward adventurism are not created, adventures will start. And there should be no doubt concerning the fact that adventures are being prepared, and big adventures at that. Take the campaign against "international terrorism" announced by the R. Reagan administration. Let us translate this deliberately nebulous slogan into the language of practical policy.

For several decades, U.S. imperialism cloaked itself in the garb of the "Alliance for Progress." Charity has now been jettisoned from the standard set of methods designed to adapt the surrounding world to Washington's tastes or, as A. Haig defines it, "secure a favorable international atmosphere for American goals and ideals." It is broadcast for all to hear that the United States and no one else will henceforth decide whether an act of any state concerning its internal affairs and its relations with other countries is justified or not. Only those changes that the United States finds suitable from the viewpoint of its own political, military and economic interests will be approved and adopted.

And if the changes are not to Washington's liking? They will be characterized as "terrorist" and will entail actions that the U.S. administration deems necessary and expedient. It has already been declared that the American leadership will actively oppose such "handiwork of international terrorism" as the national liberation movements and democratic initiatives and demonstrations, including those in favor of disarmament and a nation's choice of a socialist orientation.

J. Carter's cry -- the United States will not suffer another Iran -- became a naval armada in the western part of the Indian Ocean, half a dozen new military bases in the Near and Middle East and in Africa, rapid-deployment forces and the "American living space" doctrine. Ronald Reagan is not inclined to copy his predecessor. He believes that obeisance to humanism and growling at dictatorial regimes are superfluous and even harmful. The time has come to lift the visor, call things by their proper names and elevate counterrevolution to the official pedestal.

The way of thought and action demonstrated by Washington frequently dispirits the most exultant supporters of everything American. The West European capitals and the capitals of states of the so-called Third World are asking whither the leaders of the United States are pulling, where is the finish line and what is beyond it. The arrogant rudeness, brazenness and haughtiness are not merely indications of poor upbringing and political insensibility. Behind them are other qualities that are basically more harmful and dangerous. We are witnessing the endeavors of a circle of people that is comparatively narrow but endowed with great power to consign to oblivion the main lessons that man has derived from two world wars and postwar development. They are not averse to rehabilitating war, including nuclear war, as an instrument of policy and are sharpening this instrument.

With a glaring shortage of their own ideas, which might serve harmony between peoples, representatives of the new administration contrived in 6 months to savagely attack the fruits of the real constructive efforts of states achieved with the participation of the United States itself in the last decade. It is declared that the 1972 treaty limiting ABM systems and the 1974 protocol thereto will be of interest to the United States only until the Pentagon has more efficient technical means than it had at the time of the signing of the documents. Yet the treaty was conceived of as a permanent commitment of the parties!

There are open attacks on the SALT I agreement. It is given to understand that the United States is leaning toward also consigning to the archives this document, which initiated the process of limiting strategic offensive weapons, when the American arsenals have weapons systems making it possible, as Washington calculates, to conduct further negotiations -- if such take place at all -- from a position of strength.

The 1973 Soviet-American agreement on preventing nuclear war is not regarded in the United States as an impediment to propaganda about the "expediency" and "possibility" of the use of nuclear weapons in "defense of American interests." The use of American nuclear weapons in regional conflicts in which the enemy would not necessarily be a nuclear power is permitted. It has been revealed that the vaunted "dual guarantees" allegedly excluding the United States' unsanctioned use of nuclear weapons would be worth while in crisis situations. At times of a sharp deterioration in the situation, U.S. submarine commanders have the right to autonomously decide on the launch of nuclear missiles if radio contact with the main centers has been lost. Proposals for the creation of nuclear-free zones, the nondeployment of nuclear weapons in regions where they do not now exist, guarantees that the nuclear powers could give nonnuclear states and renunciation of the first use of nuclear weapons are being attacked more assertively than before. It is clear without superfluous commentary that none of this makes less probable a chance nuclear conflict and nuclear catastrophe of universal proportions.

Nihilism colors the U.S. approach not only to problems having a direct or indirect bearing on the Soviet Union. The settlements by which an accord was arrived at earlier with Canada and a number of other allied states are being called in question. The Reagan administration has declined to sign the prepared Law of the Sea Convention, on which the representatives of more than 150 states have worked for several years. It has demanded in the form of an ultimatum the postponement of a conference on the Indian Ocean that is to study the problem of reducing military activity in this region.

A critique of the declarations and actions of the U.S. leaders which have turned the country away from the path of detente, harmony and peace onto the slippery path of brinksmanship could be continued point by point. But this would add little to the overall picture. The captains of American imperialism have taken the helm of power to try a pirate's luck. Rules and principles sanctified by experience and accepted as the general standard are being cast overboard. An unprecedented arbitrariness, in any event in the last two decades, is being put in the place of law. The nature of weapons is coloring ever more darkly the essence and methods of policy and turning policy into the lackey of military doctrines.

Yes, international measures and negotiations designed to continue the line of peaceful coexistence and somehow maintain warmth in the hearths of detente are coming in for it the most. The spearhead of the cold war unleashed by the United States just prior to and at the outset of 1946 was aimed at destroying faith in the possibility of building peace and of creating insurmountable barriers to militarism. So too now, when everything is being done to discredit detente and portray it as an illusion, a "romantic dream" and as a fraud aimed at the "internal disarmament" of capitalism.

Society and its entire atmosphere -- political, social, cultural, moral -- provides for the perpetuation of ideas, habits and traditions. What will this trend be like? Social experience does not amount to a sum of achievements and showcases where achievements are put on display. Among its ingredients are also mistakes, failures and decisions that have not justified themselves. How should they be reflected in subsequent development? This is not an idle question. In politics, life depends on the answer to it.

The position on the question of war and peace is a true indicator of the internal stability or vulnerability of the system. The American CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR wrote recently: "On all occasions when the United States feels particularly uncertain, it instinctively reaches for a gun."

Can a society be healthy if it fears peaceful competition with another system and seeks its own advantage in the disadvantage of others? Is it possible to term modern a social system that prefers antagonism to peaceful cooperation and links its hopes not with a capacity for establishing itself under the conditions of peace but for surviving in war? Is it possible to consider realistic a policy that invents an alternative to the peaceful coexistence of states and disarmament and believes that it has revealed it in the doctrine of "American leadership" and superiority?

Peaceful coexistence and detente are not the invention of an ingenious mind. Political and ideological courage were undoubtedly needed to comprehend and accept as due and inevitable a prolonged historical era of the parallel existence of states with different systems. Particular perspicacity was needed at the time of the birth of the Soviet republic to put forward a program of disarmament in the name of the prevention of new wars and in order even then to pass sentence on war as an unsuitable and impermissible method for the clarification of relations in dispute. Not only a conviction of one's rightness but also great human wisdom were needed to make peace the cornerstone of Soviet policy, as the 26th CPSU Congress did.

All this is extraordinarily important. Why? Even if the U.S. Congress inflates the country's annual military budget to $250 billion or, as intended, $300 billion and if to the 1,500 military facilities that the United States has created beyond the confines of its national territory it adds tens or hundreds of new ones, even then the need for the preservation of peace as the primary condition for the preservation of life on earth and the realization of human rights will not have been abrogated. On the contrary, the arms race reveals for the umpteenth time the howling contradiction between the peoples' fundamental requirements and the course of world affairs and the incompatibility of a policy of aggression and military threat with the present level of development of science and productivity and the population of the planet.

The scientific-technical revolution still awaits a real revolution in military-political thinking. It will be accomplished. It will be accomplished inevitably. As Victor Hugo said: "Nothing is stronger than ideas whose time has come." It is only a question of when and at what price knowledge will be given.

The reasons that led the states of East and West just prior to and at the outset of the 1970's to conclude that the time had come to reorganize their mutual relations and make rules of good-neighborliness the basis of their actions have not faded away. The present exacerbation has been introduced to the situation artificially. The tilt toward confrontation is largely an outward manifestation of the contradictions that have arisen within the imperialist system and a result of the failures that have befallen individual politicians or individual influential political and monopoly groups.

Power politics are experiencing a kind of renaissance in the United States owing to its inability to coordinate its ideological and moral position and its actions and frame of mind with the logic of life and the regularities of historical development. Conservatism of mind becomes disheveled upon contact with the new and unaccustomed. A narrowly interpreted logic of interests prompts treatment not of the disease but its symptoms. The political authority of the United States declines -- aha, fewer people fear it, therefore, step on the gas to the arms race. Attempts are made to treat the ailments of its own economy by way of its militarization, without regard for the fact that military injections excite the economy for a short time only and, what is more, at a price that society has to pay when the results are summed up. The value of the dollar declines, and consequently burdens competitors with additional military spending and undermines their currency. The loss of economic competitiveness is compensated by a buildup of military possibilities of retaining sources of energy and raw materials and foreign markets for itself.

Strength becomes the religion of a system that has lost faith in itself and its prospects. The result is clear. The present U.S. administration may say that since World War II the situation has never been so serious. Truly a dubious achievement, but Washington has aspired to it more than anyone.

New problems will arise continuously and as long as life continues. They will require the unprejudiced approach, coolness, sober-mindedness and responsibility of all interested parties. It is not the planet's airspace alone that represents a single enclosure, and it is not the seas and oceans alone that provide means of communication. Peace on earth is single and indivisible, and security and danger have become common.

Both constructive proposals and destructive conclusions as well as everything flowing from them are the fruit of conscious activity. Good and bad policy is born in people's heads. Tension does not arise suddenly, of its own accord; it is brought about. It is brought about because tension is profitable to some people. Disarmament talks are being frustrated or forced into a standstill because some people are not interested in a halt to the arms race.

What is unacceptable in the Soviet proposals on the liquidation in Europe of the entire potential of intermediate-range nuclear weapons or intermediate-range and operational-tactical weapons, all of them -- on both the Western side and the Eastern side? The United States and its partners are incapable of formulating any intelligible, practical counterarguments. There can be none, naturally, if peace is taken as the point of reference in policy.

The Soviet Union firmly insists that the sole correct answer to the challenges that confront man remains detente, cooperation and the unification of the efforts of states to solve existing and emerging problems for the good of all mankind. "Not preparation for war, which condemns the peoples to the senseless waste of their material and spiritual wealth, but the consolidation of peace -- such is the clue to the future," L.I. Brezhnev emphasized in the CPSU Central Committee Report to the 26th party congress. The USSR will continue to suffuse the propositions of the Peace Program adopted by the congress with concrete new initiatives, endeavoring to ease the threat of war and consolidate and extend detente.

The West, primarily the U.S. leadership has to fix its position with respect to the cardinal problem of the present day and decide how important peace is for them [shift to plural as published] and whether they are prepared, in conjunction with others, to work in the name of peace, so that they themselves may live without preventing others from living.